63—2
47

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter ..... March 25th 1858.
No. .....

Case, Division .....
Shelf, Section .....
Book, No. .....

SCC
1638

A

TREATISE

ON

THE DIVINE NATURE,

EXHIBITING THE DISTINCTION

OF

THE FATHER, SON, AND HOLY SPIRIT.

BY HUMPHREY MOORE,

Pastor of the Church in Milford, N. H.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY SAMUEL T. ARMSTRONG,

For the Author.

Crocker & Brewster, Printers.

1824.

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS: to wit:
District Clerk's Office.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the second day of August, A. D. 1824, in the forty-ninth year of the Independence of the United States of America, *Samuel T. Armstrong*, of the said District, has deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof he claims as Proprietor, in the words following, *to wit:*

"A Treatise on the Divine Nature, exhibiting the distinction of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. By Humphrey Moore, Pastor of the Church in Milford, N. H."

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, intitled, "An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;" and also to an act, intitled, "An act supplementary to an Act, intitled, An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical, and other prints."

JNO. W. DAVIS,
Clerk of the District of Massachusetts.

PREFACE.

The design of the author of the following work is to offer to the public a brief and systematical treatise on the Divine Nature, exhibiting the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. However much has been written on this subject, and however ably it has been executed, the writer of these sheets has seen no *one* publication, which has examined all the principal sources of evidence of this prominent doctrine of the Scriptures. To have a *single treatise*, which will give a connected view of the leading evidences of the distinctions in the Divine Nature, appears to be an object of great importance. Whether any thing has been done in this volume to effect this object, it is submitted to a candid public.

The author is aware that in some points he differs from most Trinitarian writers; but the difference is of such a nature that it is, in his opinion, an additional weight in their scale of evidence.

In writing upon a subject, which has been discussed by a thousand hands, and in almost as many ways, it is impossible to avoid crossing the tracks of many; and in attempting to establish and defend what is supposed to be truth, it is sometimes necessary to notice and refute opinions, which militate against it. In the following treatise it has been designed to avoid, as much as possible, a controversial method

of discussion; and if the arguments and manner used do not carry conviction to the minds of any of different sentiments, it is hoped that they will not excite asperity.

It is the object of the author to prove from the Sacred Scriptures a threefold distinction in the Divine Nature, revealed by the names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He has not attempted to shew *how* these things can be; but merely to shew that these things are revealed. Though the Divine Plurality, like the Divine Existence, is incomprehensible by finite minds; yet there is nothing in it, which any one can say is more contradictory, or inconsistent, than the distinctions in human nature.

The term person, as it is often applied to the Father, Son, and Spirit, and the expression, three persons in the Godhead, have been cautiously avoided, unless they have occurred in quotations. This language is offensive to many, because it conveys to their minds (though not intended by those, who use it) an idea of separation in the Divine Nature, so that the Father, Son, and Spirit, instead of being one, appear to them to be three Gods. There is no inconvenience in avoiding this phraseology, and it is abundantly sufficient to prove that each is divine, without attempting to prove that each distinctly is God.

It has not been attempted to prove, nor has it been taken for granted, that the Humanity and Divinity of Jesus Christ constitute either one, or more persons. He is "one Lord." It appears to be inexpedient to predicate that of him, which the Scriptures do not predicate, and which unnecessarily excites opposition to the doctrine of his divinity. If the term Person, be applied to him in both natures, it is certain that its signification is different from what it is in any other application. It ought to be considered that the intimate connexion of his divinity and humanity, does not destroy their essential distinction.

The essay on the Atonement is brief; but enough is said to shew its connexion with the divinity of Christ, and the view given of its *matter*, will, it is believed, help to re-

move the most formidable objections, which are brought against it.

Much has been written, and some has been very ably written on the Sonship of Jesus Christ. It does not appear to be necessary to prove that his relationship to the Father, which is expressed by the relative term Son, was *produced* either in eternity, or in time. If it were *ever produced*, there was a period in duration, in which it did not exist; and when it came into existence, a change in the Divine Nature must have taken place. Let it be admitted that the three distinctions in the Divine Nature always existed; and that they have been revealed by the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; let the attention be fixed exclusively on the Divine Nature, not on its official capacities, nor on its union with humanity, and it appears that all debate on the subject would terminate.

In the essay on the Authority of Jesus Christ, it is shewn that there is an essential difference between *power and authority;* and this distinction, which is warranted by the original Greek, is considered a refutation of the opinion of those, who maintain that power was imparted by the Father to the Son.

The view of the Mediatorial Office of the Savior, removes, it is believed, some objections, which are brought against the Trinitarian scheme.

The Opinions of the Christian Fathers, are taken from Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, and from Milner's History of the Church of Christ. It is unnecessary to make any prefatory remarks on the other numbers of the work. The reader will easily discover their design and weight.

It may appear to many to be entirely superfluous to add another publication to the many, which have already been made upon this subject. But it ought to be considered that as long as this doctrine is assailed by its enemies, it must be defended by its friends; and that the latter must be as indefatigable and persevering in their efforts as the former. The same arguments, presented in different points of view, and

variously arranged and combined, will produce different effects; and when others, if sound, are added, they give impulse to those, which have gone before. At the present juncture, when opposition is powerful and active, it does not become the soldiers of the cross merely to stand on the ground, which their fathers valiantly defended, and use only their arms, and their method of warfare; they must keep pace with the progress of their opponents; search out all their varied modes of attack; and learn from the skill of the enemy how to repel their assaults. They must open the Magazine of divine truth; take arms from every apartment; and when, with a helmet, or a shield, or a buckler, or a sword, severally, they cannot prevail, let them take the whole armor of God, and they will bear down all opposition. To drop the figure, when evidences of the doctrine of the Trinity, drawn from one, or a few sources, are resisted, let every source of evidence be opened; let every argument be brought to its place; let the whole be marshalled, and they will not, they cannot, be ineffectual. Like the Grecian phalanx, they will be not only impenetrable; but they will break through the line of opposition.

The following work is now committed to an intelligent and candid public, and commended to the blessing of Him, whose honor and cause it is designed to vindicate.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The existence of God,	9
The Unity of God,	16
Plurality in the Divine Nature,	25
On the Father,	39
In what sense Christ is the Son of God,	46
Divine names given to Christ,	82
Divine attributes ascribed to Christ,	95
Christ the Author of Creation,	109
Christ possesses divine authority,	119
Divine honors given to the Son of God,	135
Christ's raising the dead and judging the world, are evidences of his divinity,	151
On the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus Christ,	160
Christ's divinity argued from the place he holds in our system of religion, and in believers' hearts,	168
Christ the Author of salvation,	180
On the Mediatorial office of Jesus Christ,	187
Christ the Angel of the Covenant,	197
The opinions of the ancient Jews respecting the Son of God,	218

PAGE

The opinions of the Christian Fathers respecting Jesus Christ, - - - - - - - 227

On the Atonement of Christ, - - - 249

On the Humanity of Christ, - - - 271

A summary View of the evidences of the divinity of Jesus Christ, - - - - - - 282

On the Distinction and Divinity of the Holy Spirit, 300

The connexion of Divine Plurality with other doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, - - 329

TREATISE.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

The divine existence is an interesting subject of contemplation. It concerns every intelligent creature to know from whom he has derived his being; and to whom he is responsible. It is important to know whether nature and her laws are self-existent and independent, or derived their existence and support from a Creator. It is important to know whether events occur under the capricious control of chance; or under the established laws of an infinitely wise Sovereign. To form correct sentiments on these points, it is necessary to admit, or establish by a process of argumentation, the existence of God. This first principle of religion is established in the volume of nature, and in the volume of inspiration. It has been demonstrated and defended by champions of Divinity in every age. But the subject has not lost any of its importance by length of time; nor has it been exhausted by the most able discussion. The learning and genius of every future age will find full scope in contemplating, and discussing this interesting, this infinite subject.

A variety of arguments offer their assistance in proof of the existence of God. The inanimate, and brutal creation, and our own existence are evidences of an independent first Cause. "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." In every part of the natural world, there is a continual succession of changes. The face of the earth assumes, at every revolving season, a new aspect. One growth of the vegetable kingdom comes forward, matures, declines, dies, putrifies, and gives nourishment to a succeeding crop. Of the brutal creation individuals are continually perishing; and others take their place. In the rational world one generation passeth away and another taketh its place. This mutation among the different orders of beings proves that they are not self-existent; that they are not eternal; and proves, of course, that they derived their existence from a Creator. Because, what is changeable is subject to dissolution and extinction. What is subject to fall into non-existence might, without contradiction or absurdity in the supposition, *have been* in that state. It follows, consequently, that all things, which are mutable may have had a beginning, and an author of their existence. As substances, which are changeable in their nature are not self-existent, it follows that they must have had an origin, and a Creator.

Between the different parts of the natural world there is a mutual connexion and dependence. The different particles of matter, which compose this globe, are united with, and rest upon each other. The vegetable kingdom springs from the earth, and is supported by the elements. The irrational and the rational world derive their origin from a parental stock; and are supported by the productions of the earth. A series of connected links of dependencies cannot make an independent chain of beings. Dependence may be traced from one thing to another;

from the smallest particle of matter up to the greatest object, which falls within the compass of human sight; and the question will arise, on what does this depend? Rise as high on this ascending series as imagination can soar, and the same question will return, till we fix on that Being, who is uncreated, eternal, and self-existent. This is the central point, from which every thing proceeds; to which every thing gravitates, and by which every thing is sustained.

In the natural world there are evident marks of design, of wise design. There is a just proportion between the different parts of creation. The mountains are weighed in scales and the hills in a balance. So exactly equipoised, are the spheres, which compose our system, that they perform their rotations, and revolutions in stated times. This curiously organized machine was not fitted up merely to make a display of mechanical skill. It is calculated to answer the most valuable purposes. There is a happy subserviency between the different parts of the system. The inanimate part of the world affords support to the brutal creation; and both afford support and enjoyment for mankind. The earth is covered with a great variety of the richest productions; the heavens are spread out like a curtain; and ornamented with shining and useful orbs. The elements are combined to sustain the life, and promote the enjoyment of all classes of creatures, from the smallest insect to the lord of this lower world. It is impossible to account for this just proportion, this mutual subserviency of different parts; and this wise design in every part, unless we trace them all to an infinitely wise Creator and Governor. When we see a machine of curious construction, and calculated for some valuable purpose, we never suppose that it derived its origin from a casual combination of parts. But we trace it to mechanical skill and design. With equal propriety we may trace the great machine of the universe to the incomparable skill, and benevolent design of a divine Artist.

The occurrence of events, which cannot be controlled by human power, and the accomplishment of ends by means directly contrary to those, which human wisdom employs, are an argument in favor of the existence of God. The rise of vapor, the formation of clouds, the fall of rain, the artillery of the skies, the succession of day and night, the rotation of the seasons, the rise, progress, and decline of the vegetable kingdom, manifest a superhuman power. Human wisdom is often employed to effectuate some design. All the energies of the mind are called into operation for the invention of means to ensure success. Exertion is so employed and a train of events is so arranged, that not a doubt of success obscures the prospect. But it frequently happens that the wisdom of the wise is brought to nought; that events take a retrograde course; and the most sanguine expectations are blasted. As if nature had changed her laws, the most promising circumstances become adverse; and the design, which was almost accomplished, proves abortive. On the other hand, when adverse events take place in rapid succession; when nothing but the severest trials appear in prospect; and it is beyond human power to turn the current of events, something unforeseen takes place, stays the progress of adversity, and discloses delightful prospects. History, both sacred and profane, give abundant evidence of the general government and special interposition of a Being, infinitely more powerful and wise, than the most exalted creature.

The general sentiment of mankind is in favor of the existence of God. It is probable that every nation and tribe on earth believe the existence of a supreme Being. However remote from each other, and however destitute of intercourse with the rest of the world, they all appear to coincide in this one sentiment,—there is a God. The Creator has not left himself without witness. He originally impressed his image upon humanity. When this *moral* likeness was

effaced, a fearful belief of his existence still remained. This sentiment must have been generally engraven upon the human mind; or irresistible evidence from the works of nature must have been communicated to the senses. Those, who have traced the works of nature; viewed her operations; and studied her laws, have inferred that they depend on a first Cause. The untutored tribes of the wilderness, without any regular process of argumentation, have drawn the same conclusion. The learned and the barbarian have traced the footsteps of the Deity on earth; and have read his name in the firmament written with letters of light.

Further, mankind have always felt a dependence on some remote cause; they have felt a consciousness of responsibility; and they have always looked to some being as the object of their greatest fears, or of their greatest hopes. A consciousness of right and wrong is inherent in the human mind. The Gentiles had this law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness. As the instinct of brutes enables them to distinguish between salubrious and noxious food, and instigates them to self-defence, or to flee from danger; so a moral sense in man distinguishes between good and evil; and would persuade him to contend against spiritual enemies, or escape from them. This moral sense dwells not on abstract principles, but extends its views to that Being who is the Standard of moral excellence, the supreme Arbiter of moral actions, the Disposer of retributions.

Some have argued against nature, against consciousness, against reason, against the senses; and they have concluded that there is no God. On the boundless regions of chance they find the origin, the support and control of every thing. According to their own principles, it was by *chance* they formed this sentiment; by *chance* they may change it; and if they should fall into the belief of a God, they will find it to be not an act of chance, but a solemn reality. These

aberrations from the great mass of mankind prove that there are established laws, from which they deviated; and they prove that there may be monsters no less in the intellectual, than in the brutal world. The general sentiment of mankind furnishes abundant proof that there is a God; and that he has given evidence of his existence.

The sacred scriptures not only declare that there is a God, but they are themselves an evidence of his existence. In every production we look for an adequate cause. What is not superior to human power may be attributed to that power. But what far exceeds human exertion must be traced to a higher cause. That system of religion, recorded in the Bible, infinitely exceeds any human production. The ingenuity of man has often been tried to form a system of religion; but their best productions have betrayed the weakness, or baseness of their authors. But the christian system displays a depth of wisdom, to which human ingenuity can never attain, and which it can never fathom. Its morality is unblemished. Its piety is pure and fervent. Its exhibitions of the Deity are indescribably sublime. Its method of salvation embraces, at once, the most striking displays of wisdom, power, and goodness. Its retributions are admirably calculated to animate the hopes and rouse the fears of the human soul. The more its parts are examined and compared, the more visible will be their harmony. The more minutely it is investigated, the more clearly will its perfection appear. The deeper researches are made into this system, the more amazing will appear its length and breadth, its height and depth. When human wisdom has gone to its utmost extent, it can only stand on the *borders* of this divine system; admire its amazing dimensions; and exclaim, "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"

In the formation of substance out of nothing, and in the support of the universe are the highest conceivable

displays of power. Almighty power alone could create and support the world. The organization of the universe; its regulations; the correspondence and subserviency of its various parts; the control of events, by which important ends are attained by indirect means, manifest a wisdom unlimited in degree, and in its operation. The abundant means of support, convenience and delight, which are bestowed on mankind; the connexion of the highest happiness with duty; the means, which are employed to repair the ruins of human nature; the sacrifice which was made for rebellious creatures, and the provision, which is made for their future enjoyment, are the most striking displays of benevolence and goodness. Nothing but mercy and love, which knew no bounds, could have made such communications to this ungrateful, this rebellious world. The Being, in whom these infinite perfections dwell, is the Creator, the Governor and Savior of the world. He is God.

THE UNITY OF GOD.

THE existence of God is the foundation of religion. He is the Author of all other beings. He supports all the works of creation. His will is the law of his creatures. His law is not established by an arbitrary decree; but it is founded on those principles of moral fitness, which are coincident with the relationship of beings; and which are immutable. To do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly, did not become duties *because* they were required; but they were required *because* they were duties. Had there been no God, there would have been no beings; no relationship between beings; no moral fitness connected with such relationship. But as there is a God, and he is the Author of all creatures, he is the foundation of the connexion subsisting between beings; he is the foundation of the principles of moral right which are inseparable from such connexion. Agreeably to the nature of his creatures, and agreeably to his own holy nature, he formed a system of religion. He established in human nature a perceptibility of the divine Existence; and implanted in the soul a sense of moral obligation.

Mankind are conscious of responsibility. They perceive that they did not originate themselves; their possessions; their privileges; their enjoyments. They perceive that the Being, who made these communications, has a just claim on them; and that they are under a correspondent obligation. This general sen-

timent of responsibility was impressed upon the mind by the Creator; and proves that he is not only the Author of a system of religion; but proves that he is the Author of religious sentiment in the heart.

The opinions which men form of God, give a decisive character to their religious system. If they form correct ideas of his nature, character, government and offices, they form, generally, correct ideas of the whole system of religion. If they have incorrect ideas of the Deity, they are generally defective in their religious sentiments. If they believe that he is the only living and true God, they believe that he alone is entitled to religious homage. If they have exalted ideas of the divine nature, they have humiliating conceptions of humanity. If they believe divine sovereignty, they believe human dependence. If they believe that God is the only Savior, they trust only in him. On the other hand, if they believe there is a multiplicity of deities, they divide their religious homage among them. They practise idolatry. If they believe that God does not notice the affairs of mortals, they do not venerate the divine law; their hopes and fears are not excited by the promise, or threatening of retribution. The Heathen have generally, if not universally, believed the existence of a multiplicity of gods. They have ascribed to them various natures and characters; and they have varied their worship and service according to the ideas they had formed of their respective natures. To one they have offered the fruits of the earth. To another they have made presentations of indecency. To another they have offered human sacrifices; varying their offerings according to the supposed nature and pleasure of their deities.

Those, who believe Christianity is a divine revelation, form various ideas of God. This variety of sentiment upon this fundamental article of religion affects their creed through the whole system. The guilt of sin is measured by the dignity and holiness of that

Being, against whom it is committed. The value of the atonement is estimated not only by the evil of sin; but by the excellence and capacity of him, who made the sacrifice. The ideas formed of future reward and punishment correspond with the sentiments entertained of the Deity. Trace all human creeds, and it will be found that all their features take their peculiarities from the belief of the first article of religion.

It is of the highest importance, therefore, to form correct ideas of God. It is not expected that finite minds can form *adequate* conceptions of the divine nature; or of the infinitude of his attributes. But it is necessary to believe there is such a nature possessing such attributes. The deity is the basis of religion; and the opinion formed of him is the chief corner stone in a believer's creed.

In the formation of every argument it is necessary to lay down correct premises; because on them the conclusion depends. In every science it is necessary to have a knowledge of its first principles. These are the basis of the whole system. In the science of Theology, as in all other sciences, there are fundamental truths, which must be admitted or proved, before inquiries can be prosecuted with success. The most important of these, and which claims the first attention, is, the *unity* of God.

1. The first argument, which offers itself in proof of this truth, is, there appears to be no *need* of more than one God. In treating subjects philosophically it is correct to admit no more causes, than are necessary to account for the effects produced. One Being of almighty power is sufficient to create the world. One Being of infinite wisdom is sufficient to organize it, and form a constitution for its government. One Being of infinite goodness is competent to the administration of its laws. The same Being, who created, organized and supports one world, can multiply them to any extent he pleases. It is no harder to conceive

of infinite attributes residing in one Being, than to conceive of them residing in many beings. As all the effects, which are visible, or fall within the compass of human apprehension, may be traced to one Cause, possessing infinite perfections, there is no *necessity* of inferring more than one.

2. The *unity* of God is argued from the harmony and mutual subserviency of different parts of the world; and from the uniformity of its government. There is a just proportion between the various parts of the world. The elements are so adjusted, that one does not prevail against another. The globe is wisely balanced with earth and water. The spheres, which compose this system, are so exactly proportioned as to size and distance, that they perform their revolutions with the greatest precision. There is a remarkable correspondence and subserviency between the different parts of the world; between different classes of animals; and between the brutal and the intelligent creation. The face of the earth is agreeably and usefully variegated with hills and vallies. There is a happy subserviency between the atmosphere, earth, and water. The different parts of this system so correspond that they are mutually beneficial. The sun enlightens and warms the earth. The moon and the host of heaven, not only adorn the canopy of the skies, but they shed their milder rays. The regular succession of day and night promotes the growth of the vegetable kingdom; and affords a pleasing and refreshing variety to human nature. The rotation of the seasons is wisely calculated to bring forward and mature the productions of the earth, and to restore its wasted strength.

The vegetable world affords support to a great part of the animal kingdom. Every class of animals finds subsistence in its natural situation. Different species of animals are mutually useful. Some afford support to others. If the Author of nature had paused here; and had gone no further, his work might have ap-

peared marvellously great, but he would have manifested no wise, nor important design. The vast apparatus of the natural world is calculated and appears to be designed ultimately for the use and enjoyment of man. The vegetable and animal part of the world afford their productions for his service, convenience and delight.

There is a *uniformity* of government in the natural world. The herb yieldeth seed after its kind. Every class of animals preserve their similarity of appearance, nature and habits. They also retain distinguishing peculiarities. Seed time and harvest, summer and winter, heat and cold, are established by a perpetual decree. If, from year to year, there be some difference in the time of productions, and some slight variations from the ordinary course of events, it does not militate against the *uniformity* of divine government; but it only proves that the world is governed by *general* laws. In all the works of nature, and in those laws which regulate the world, there appears to be only one design, the manifestation of divine excellence in promoting the happiness of human nature.

Had there been two artists engaged in creating and organizing the world, it could not be expected there would be a perfect correspondence and subserviency of various parts. It could not be expected there would be a unity of design running through the whole system. It is not probable that two separate powers would perfectly harmonize in any one method of government. They would, undoubtedly have their favorite plans; and pursue their favorite courses. Consequently there would not be harmony between the different parts of the world; nor uniformity in the effects of their administration. Jealousy might rise between these rival sovereigns, and instead of uniting to promote harmony, uniformity and tranquillity through the system, they might throw the whole into commotion, and produce the greatest disorder. They

might forget the interest of their subjects, and attempt to establish their individual superiority. If the two artists and sovereigns were of one design, and possessed equal perfections, they consequently would possess an infinitude of attributes. They being distinct and separate beings, each would possess one half of this infinitude. This supposes that infinite power, wisdom and goodness are individually capable of division, and separation; that they are made up of parts; and that they may be formed by a progressive series of finite qualities. If these two possess the same kind of nature; are united in design, and in operation, and constitute only one infinitude, they would not be two distinct and separate existences, but they would be literally one nature.

3. There is abundant evidence that there is *one* God, eternal, self-existent and independent. He exists of necessity; that is, it is impossible that he never should have existed; and it is impossible that he should cease to exist. There is a primary power in the universe. It is impossible that this power should have created itself; and it is equally impossible that it should destroy itself; for this would suppose a power superior to the highest power. These things cannot be predicated of more than one power. There can be only one power necessarily existing. If an equal power be supposed to exist, it must depend on the will and pleasure of the first power for liberty of the least operation. If equals cannot destroy equals, they can counteract and neutralize each other. Consequently there cannot be two separate independencies; two separate self-existencies, nor two separate eternals.

It is equally absurd to suppose there are *inferior* divinities. A divinity has a divine nature and divine attributes. What is divine is not circumscribed; and consequently is infinite. What is infinite is not capable of *degrees* of comparison. Consequently there cannot be superior and inferior divinities. If a

deity be supposed, which is inferior to the supreme God, he is inferior in nature and attributes. Duration, which is inferior to eternity, is temporal. Power and wisdom which are inferior to infinity, are finite. A temporal finite being is a creature, consequently he is not truly a deity.

The Heathen admit a multiplicity of gods. But they esteem one superior to the rest. They vary their religious honors in quality and degree according to the supposed excellence of their respective deities. It is not doubted that the Creator can and does deputize his creatures to act with a limited authority. He has constituted man lord of this lower world. But this does not vest him with a claim to divine honors. The prince of the power of the air has authority to work in the children of disobedience. But this prerogative does not entitle him to divine worship. The inferior gods of the Heathen, whether they be works of their own hands, objects of nature, or creatures of their imaginations, bear no comparison with real Divinity; and they are not entitled to divine honors. In view of the *one* God they are a vanity and a lie.

Mankind, ever since the apostasy, have been inclined to make lords many and gods many; and to practise idolatry. Even those, who enjoyed some rays of revealed light, loved darkness rather than light; and in the shades of nature they fancied similitudes of the Deity; or with an artist's skill they contrived forms, which called forth their devotional feelings. One great object of divine revelation was to correct the world of this error, and lead them to the knowledge of the only living and true God. So important was this subject that the first command of the decalogue was directed to this very point; "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." God has often declared in his word that there is no other god. "Unto thee it was shewed that thou mightest know that the Lord he

is God, there is none else besides him." Solomon, in his address to the people after his consecrating prayer in the temple, uses almost the same language: "that all the people of the earth may know that the Lord is God; and that there is none else." Similar language is repeatedly used in the Old Testament. Christ, who bore testimony to the truth, taught the same doctrine, the *unity* of God. His language is, There is but *one* good, that is God. In the language of the Old Testament, he said, "The Lord our God is one Lord." Again he said, This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the *only* true God. In all his devotions he addressed but *one* God.

4. The coincidence of the various parts of the sacred scriptures is a strong argument in favor of the *unity* of their Author. This volume was written by many hands; at distant periods; and at places remote from each other. Had the objects of the inspired writers been different, or had they been under the guidance of different spirits, a striking contrariety would have appeared in their writings. But, as their object is evidently the same, as there is a remarkable coincidence in their relation of the same things, as there is a perfect agreement between the prophetic writings and the history of subsequent events, there is the strongest evidence that their authors were under the direction of *one and the same* Spirit.

Some parts of the sacred scriptures appear, at first view, to be inconsistent; and other parts appear to be dark. But when they are investigated, they appear consistent, and the religion of the Old Testament was remarkably well calculated for the Jewish nation till the advent of the Messiah. A knowledge of the ancient customs of the Jews, a knowledge of the idolatries of neighboring nations bring to view excellences of the Jewish religion, which are not discovered by a superficial observer. Those parts of God's word, which seem to militate against each other, are found

to be reconcilable and harmonious. Those seeming blemishes, which appear on the pages of divine inspiration are only dark spots on the vision of the human mind. When the understanding is purged from moral darkness and corruptness, it will discover the perfections of our holy religion; the coincidence of its parts; the unity of its design, and *the unity of its Author.*

PLURALITY IN THE DIVINE NATURE.

After the apostasy mankind were exceedingly prone to idolatry. The heathen, in every age, have paid their devotions to a variety of deities. Even the Hebrews, who were enlightened by divine revelation, and were taught the existence of only one God, often departed from this knowledge, and ascribed divine honors to objects of nature, and to works of men's hands. When God communicated to the world a system of religion, it might well be expected he would guard the human mind against this error; that he would distinguish himself from heathen gods; that he would communicate nothing which would give the least countenance to a multiplicity of deities, or to idolatry. When God wrote the moral law on tables of stone, he commanded first, that they should have no other gods before him. The distinguishing characteristic of Israel was, that they worshipped *one* God. Moses, who was under divine influence, and wrote agreeably to the pattern shewn him by the divine Being, guarded the doctrine of the divine *unity* with the greatest care, lest Israel should blend with surrounding nations; fall into idolatry; and lose the knowledge of the true God. His language is, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is *one* Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." That these words might not depart from their minds, he required them to bind them upon their hands; and

that they should be as frontlets between their eyes. The other prophets adopted similar language. Christ supported the same sentiment, and the apostles copied his example.

Notwithstanding the *unity* of God is a prominent doctrine in the Scriptures; yet both the Old and New Testament contain many terms and phrases, which evidently convey an idea of plurality in the divine nature. The original word in the Old Testament, for the name God, is used in the plural number. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." This is the first time the divine name is used in the Bible; and it is used in the plural number, connected with a singular verb. When God was about to form man, he said, "Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness." After the apostasy of our first parents, "The Lord God said, behold the man is become as one of *us*, to know good and evil." When God looked down from heaven and beheld the tower, which the children of men builded, he said, "Go to, let *us* go down and there confound their language." God speaking by the mouth of his prophet inquires, "Whom shall I send? Who will go for *us?*" Other passages contain the name of God in the plural number.

God is jealous for the honor of his name. He will not give his glory to another. He will have no other gods before him. He has ever manifested the greatest abhorrence of idolatry. Why then did God reveal himself by a name of the plural number, when he knew that the heathen, and even his peculiar people were exceedingly prone to idolatry; and would greedily catch at every circumstance, which appeared to countenance their favorite worship? Why was the doctrine of *one* God guarded with such precision and circumspection; and the name of God expressed in the plural number, as if there were gods many? His name was first communicated in the plural number; and lest men should, from this circumstance, infer a multiplicity of gods, it was expressly declared that

the Lord God was one Lord; and that they should have no other gods. Moses was undoubtedly aware what use the people would make of the plurality contained in the divine name; and it is not probable he would have used this term excepting under the sanction of divine authority.

Some have attempted to explain away the meaning of the plurality in the divine name by considering it an imitation of the royal style. But there is no evidence that kings applied to themselves the plural number in the days of Moses. We find no instance, in the sacred scriptures, of this royal mode of expression till about a thousand years after Moses wrote his history. Artaxerxes, king of Persia, in answer to a letter sent to him by his chancellor, scribe and the rest of their companions, says, "The letter which ye sent unto *us*, hath been plainly read before me." Is it probable that God borrowed his titles, Majesty, most High, Prince, Sovereign, King, from earthly potentates? Is it probable that the Author of language is indebted to marks of royal honor for the formation of his own name, or for the mode of his expression? Is it probable that the Creator copied the creature? When it is considered how prone people were to deify works of art, animals, and departed spirits, it is easy to account for the origin of the custom of giving divine titles and divine honors to men in the most elevated stations. Repeated instances are found in history, in which men, who were distinguished for heroism, and more distinguished for vain conceit, pretended to be descendants of the gods; and assumed divine prerogatives. It was natural for them, when speaking in the first person, to use the plural number in imitation of the name of God. It is not a little surprising that Christian people should perpetuate this heathenish practice. But while it proves the power of example, it likewise proves that there is a certain plurality in the divine original, which gave rise to this custom.

In the New Testament the divine name is used in the singular number. When the individuity of divine plurality was distinctly revealed, the more obscure Hebrew mode of expressing the divine name ceased. If the name of God in the New Testament be not used in the plural number, a plurality of singulars is used, to which divine nature is ascribed. This gives a clearer view of plurality in God than the ancient Hebrew form of expression. The New Testament was to be circulated among the Jews for the purpose of converting them to Christianity. As they believed in only one God, no form of speech would unnecessarily be used by the writers of the Christian religion, which would convey to them the idea of a multiplicity of deities. As it was also to be circulated among heathen, it was necessary to use the greatest care in the choice of words, lest encouragement should be given to their idolatry. As the forms of speech used in the scriptures naturally suggest the idea of more gods than one, or of a plurality in the divine nature; and as the scriptures declare in the plainest and strongest terms that there is but one God, it follows that there is a plurality in his nature.

The Hebrew language is remarkable for its simplicity, and for its significancy. Proper names, as well as the names of a genus and species, are often expressive of the nature or properties of the person or thing named. Various names are given to the Supreme Being; and each name is significant of his nature, office, or of some of his attributes. In the first verse in the Bible the Hebrew name of God is expressive of his power. When he is represented in the act of creation there is a striking propriety in giving him a name expressing his might. When God commissioned Moses to lead Israel out of bondage, he made himself known to him by a name signifying independent existence. At other times he revealed himself by names signifying government and excellence. From the peculiar significancy of Hebrew names,

especially the names of God, an appropriate sense is undoubtedly to be given to the divine name, when used in the plural number. It is hard to conceive what appropriate sense can be extracted from this mode of expression, unless it be a certain plurality in the divine nature.

The principal Jewish cabalistic authors, both ancient and modern, believed a plurality in the nature of God. In one of the most ancient Jewish books, a book said to be as ancient as Abraham himself, there is this passage. "They are three lights, *an ancient light, a pure light, and a most pure light; nevertheless all these are only one God.*" In another place, the same author, on the same subject says, "And know ye, the *three high nominations* all are united together; and never are divided." Another cabalistic author observes, "The three highest no eye ever saw, and there is not there either separation or division."*

A passage in Deuteronomy, 6:4, offers its aid in support of the sentiment under consideration. In our translation it is, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord, our God is one Lord." A modern Jew,† who was a considerable critic in the Hebrew language translates this passage probably more justly. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord, our God, the Lord is one." After some explanation of this interpretation,the author adds, "Do not mistake me and think that there are three Gods of three different essences, neither one God without the plurality of persons; but yet there is one only God in nature and essence, and three distinct persons, all equal in power and glory; and coequal and coeval from all eternity." The opinion of the Jewish rabbies is of no inconsiderable weight in this argument. They were expert in the Hebrew scriptures; and they well understood the idiom and the peculiar force of their own language.

The different works of the Supreme Being, which are recorded in the sacred scriptures, form an argu-

* See Monis. † Idem.

ment in favor of a plurality in his nature. It is recorded that God created the world; that he gave a law to the human race; that the blood of God was shed to purchase his church;* and that those who are born again are born of God. Here are three distinct kinds of work, the formation and government of man, an expiation for sin, and a reparation of ruined human nature. God formed and published a law for the regulation of human life, and sanctioned it by threatening punishment for disobedience. The Son of God magnified and honored this law by humbling himself and bearing the sins of men in his own body on the accursed tree. The Spirit of God sanctifies the human heart, and restores unto it the divine moral likeness. If there be no kind of plurality, no kind of individuality in the divine nature, then the same, who threatened, made satisfaction to himself to support his own authority; the same, whose authority was violated, paid the ransom and gives willingness to accept its benefits. Should the supreme ruler of a nation adopt this method of government; should he suffer the evil consequences incurred by his rebellious subjects; and then restore them to his favor, would he support his authority? would he manifest disapprobation of rebellion? The same difficulties would seem to lie against divine government, if there were entire singularity in the divine nature. In the whole economy of redemption there is abundant evidence that there is a ground in the divine nature for mutual

* Acts 20:28. There are found five different readings of this passage, beside that of the received text, which is τῦ θεῦ, viz. τῦ Κυρίυ, τῦ Χριστῦ, τῦ Κυρίυ θεῦ, τῦ θεῦ καὶ Κυρίυ, and τῦ Κυρίυ καὶ θεῦ. Wetstein and Griesbach consider the evidence to be in favor of τῦ Κυρίυ. Wakefield, who was not disposed to give his aid to support the doctrine of Christ's divinity, prefers the received reading τῦ θεῦ; but he is careful to explain away all the natural meaning of the text. He states that Griesbach's testimony respecting the Ethiopic version is "infamously false." "The MSS. in which it" (i. e. τῦ θεῦ) "is found amounts to fourteen, and it is quoted or referred to by a great many of the fathers." See Middleton on the Greek article, pp. 227—232.

In five exemplaribus legitur Κυρίυ καὶ θεῦ. Beza. Illustris sententia de Deitate Christi, et unione duarum naturarum, qua uni tribuitur proprietas alterius. Sanguis Jesu est sanguis Dei proprius, vi κοινωνίας ἰδιωματων. See Poole on the place.

intercourse; for mutual contract, and for mutual fulfilment. One proposes, another accepts. One supplicates, another hears and answers. One sends, another is sent; and the whole is done with unity of design, unity of pursuit, and unity of nature.

In the scheme of redemption there are three distinct offices; and they are filled by three of distinct and characteristic names. The Father sends the Son; the Son sends the Spirit. The Spirit purifies the heart. The Son makes expiation for sin, and intercession for sinners. The Father accepts what both have done. There is no foundation for saying that God may be one in all respects, and at the same time may fill three separate offices. It appears to be inconsistent that God in simple unity should act in different offices at one and the same time. It is inconsistent that one should negotiate with himself; that he should supplicate himself; mediate between an offending party and himself; and in a formal manner accept his own transactions. To avoid this inconsistency it appears to be necessary to admit a plurality in the Deity. It is equally absurd to account for the different offices in the scheme of redemption, filled by different ones of different names, by personifying particular attributes of the Deity. It is hard to conceive how the faculties of the human mind could hold intercourse with each other, and be distinct parties in any transaction. It is equally hard to conceive how individual divine attributes could separate themselves into different parties; negotiate with each other, and each fulfil its appointment. Wisdom could form a plan of salvation; but, without power, it could not carry it into operation. Power could effect any proposed design, but it could not project the method of its accomplishment. Benevolence could effectuate nothing without wisdom to devise, and power to execute. A single divine attribute, therefore, cannot fill any office in the work of redemption, nor perform the duties of such office. This hypothesis, then, does

not account for the appearance of plurality in the divine nature.

The opinion and practice of the people in India, and in other parts of the East, serve to corroborate this sentiment. "The Hindoos believe in one god Brahma, the creator of all things; and yet they represent him as subsisting in three persons; and they worship one or other of these persons throughout every part of India. And what proves that they hold this doctrine distinctly is, that their most ancient representation of the Deity is formed of one body and three faces. Nor are these representations confined to India alone; but they are to be found in other parts of the East."*

In this quarter of the world God created man, and made the first communications of his will. Here Christ was born; and nature, men and angels bore testimony to his birth. The Hindoo history bears some striking features of the history of the gospel. In India there have been discovered vernacular writings, which contain testimonies of Christ. They mention a Prince, who reigned about the time of the Christian era. His history relates events, which bear a striking resemblance to the advent, birth, miracles, death and resurrection of the Savior. In this part of the world Christ published the gospel. Here the apostles propagated the glad tidings of salvation. But before their decease many of the churches of Asia, became exceedingly corrupt in sentiment and practice. Religion declined by degrees. People fell into idolatry. After a lapse of ages the same people, who were distinguished for Christian knowledge, became grossly ignorant and superstitious; and practised idolatry, which was marked with indecency and cruelty. But in the midst of their ignorance and idolatrous practice there were found some vestiges of Christianity. Some events, which occurred when Christ was upon earth stood recorded; and some

* Buchanan.

doctrines of the gospel were strikingly represented. Doctrines relating to the true God, they applied to their false gods. The doctrine of the atonement they used in their idolatry. Whence originated these rays of Christianity in this benighted quarter of the world? Whence originated among them the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of the atonement? These were not human inventions. These were undoubtedly relics of revealed truth, which had long been preserved amidst the rubbish of heathenish ignorance and superstition. These fundamental doctrines of Christianity, like the pillars of nature, have remained where they were first established. The ignorance, the wickedness, the imaginations of men have perverted these doctrines; but they never have destroyed them. How did these fundamental principles of Christianity find existence; how have they been preserved in the heart of heathenish Asia, if they were not planted there by their Author, and supported by his power? Let people, who have ever lived under the sunshine of the Gospel, and have so refined it, that they have robbed it of almost every divine feature, go to India, and from the three-faced idol of the poor Hindoo, learn the doctrine of the Trinity.

Plurality in the divine nature is a mystery. Some pretend to discover mystery in every part of scripture. Others attempt to explain mystery; and consequently they explode it. In treating this subject it is necessary only to shew that the doctrine of divine plurality is contained in the scriptures; and that it does not contradict the dictates of reason. Mystery signifies "something above human intelligence; something awfully obscure." It is not surprising that the subject under consideration should be above human apprehension. It cannot be expected that a finite mind can comprehend the infinite Spirit. We do not understand the mode of our own existence. We do not understand the operations of our own minds. We do not understand the union of soul and body; and

how one affects the other. It is not within the limits of our understandings to know how two distinct substances, matter and spirit, constitute unity of person. But we know that we have existence, that we have mental exercises; that our bodies and souls are united; and that they constitute but one person. If we cannot comprehend our own existence, it cannot be expected that we can comprehend "the degrees or forms of the Deity."

The divine plurality is not a plurality of nature. If there were a plurality of divine natures, there would be distinct divine beings; there would be a multiplicity of deities. It would be a contradiction to say that several divine natures make but one divine nature; that several Gods make but one God. But it is not a contradiction to say the Father is God; the Son is God; the Holy Spirit is God; and these three are one.

The Creator, by the communication of reason made a partial revelation of himself. All his other revelations are coincident with this; or, at least, they do not militate against it. In his sacred word he makes known truths, which the utmost efforts of reason could never discover. But he discloses nothing, which contradicts the dictates of this power of the mind. In the works of nature there is mystery. In ourselves there is mystery. It is not surprising then that there should be mystery in the mode of the divine existence. A Trinity in Unity is this mystery.

But this is not the only mystery in the divine nature. God's eternity is above our comprehension While we believe the existence of this attribute, we form no adequate idea of it. We believe the self-existence of the divine nature. But as we are acquainted with only a series of dependencies, we have no just conception of absolute independence. God hears our supplications. But we understand not how he perceives the voice of prayer without the organ of hearing. He perceives the operations of our

minds. But we understand not how a Spirit is acquainted with the exercises, motives and feelings of other spirits. These are mysteries, and they are probably as far beyond our reach, as the doctrine of Trinity in Unity.

We have not an adequate idea of the plurality in the divine nature. We do not understand that ground of distinction in the Deity, by which one addresses others of the same nature; and all compose but one essence. The scriptures authorize us to believe this ground of distinction, and this bond of Union. But *how* this is without division and separation of nature, and without confusion of individuality is far beyond our deepest research. Omnipresence is an acknowledged attribute of the Deity. God is in every place. In every part of creation he displays the infinitude of his attributes; and he does this without division or separation of himself. If it be rationally admitted that God is in every place, it is not contrary to rationality that he was in the man Christ Jesus.

Many, by attempting to explain and illustrate the doctrine of divine plurality, have rendered it more obscure; and have given it the appearance of absurdity. Because the divine Being speaks in the three persons, I, thou, he; because distinct offices, works and attributes are attributed to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, it is concluded there is ground in the divine nature for distinct personalities. As we have not distinct ideas of divine plurality, it is impossible to give distinct and appropriate names, which will justly designate the individuality. It is probable, however, that no term in our language would better mark the distinction in the divine nature, than the term person. In our English Testament the word person is once applied to the Father; and several times it is applied to the Son. But in the original they are different words, and of different significations. But neither of them appears primarily to signify person. The original of the word person, applied to the Father signifies

self-existence or distinct substance. When it is applied to the Son, it signifies face or presence. These instances, therefore, afford no argument for the term persons; and as many view the expression, when applied to one God, as a contradiction, it is preferable to adhere as closely as possible to the language of divine inspiration in representing a doctrine so mysterious.

The greatest care needs to be used in the choice of terms to express our ideas of the divine Nature. If we have clear ideas of any truth, we can clearly communicate them. But when we have confused ideas of a doctrine, or no ideas at all, it is in vain to attempt to supply the deficiency by any selection of words. From the inspired writings we have a distinct idea that there *is* a plurality, a trinity in the divine nature. But when we pursue our inquiries respecting the *mode* of this three-fold substance, ideas fail and language also fails.

The words plurality and Trinity are not found in the sacred writings. But as the divine name is repeatedly used in the plural number; as the appellations, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are given to the divine Being, it is conceived there is just ground for the use of these terms.

Some have attempted to illustrate this doctrine by comparing it with the union of the human body, soul and spirit; and likewise by comparing it with the three principal faculties of the human mind. These comparisons may go so far, perhaps, as to shew that the doctrine is not contradictory or absurd. But they fall far short of illustrating the doctrine. The human body, soul and spirit have properties peculiar to themselves. What is predicated of one cannot be predicated of the others. Neither do these three constitute one essence. The understanding, will and affections are simple qualities of the mind. They not only sustain different offices in the human intellect, but they are entirely different. Some suppose there is no need of

admitting any distinction in the divine nature; that he, who is the same in all respects, acts in different *offices*. But the divine law and the nature of the atonement do not admit this illustration.

It is in vain to draw comparisons from the material, or from the intelligent world for the explanation of the doctrine of divine plurality. There may be some *points* of contact in the comparison; but there is no parallellism between the creature and the Creator. "Who in the Heaven can be compared unto the Lord; who among the sons of the mighty can be likened unto the Lord?"*

* It is worthy of remark, that the same name of plural number, which is applied to God, (אלהים) is also applied to Dagon, the god of the Philistines; to Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Zidonians; and to Moses. Another plural name of God (אדונים) is also applied to individual men. The names of some individual things are expressed by nouns of the plural number. But does this prove that there is either no plurality in the divine Being, or that there is a plurality in human nature, or in particular things? This conclusion would be hardly logical. The first name in the Bible given to God is a noun of plural number. The same name is frequently given to him in the Old Testament. The idolatrous nations, which lived not very remote from the Jews, were undoubtedly acquainted with the name of the God they worshipped. They applied the same plural name to individuals of their deities; and when they applied other names, they sometimes applied them in the plural number. It was natural for them to give a name to their deities as honorable as that, which the Hebrews gave to their God. If there was an appropriate significancy in the plural number, when applied to the true God, it is not incredible that heathen should use the same number in giving names to their idols, designing to equalize them with him; as far as names could do it. Nor is it a striking peculiarity of the Hebrew language, that a name of masculine termination should be given to a goddess. For the Latin Deus and the Greek θεος, are used to signify both god and goddess. Besides, there were many idols of the same name, which justifies the use of the plural number.

The divine name of plural number was given to Moses. I have made thee a God, אלהים, to Pharaoh. Ex. 7:1. אל, the root of this word, signifies, *to interpose, intervene, mediate, come or be between, for protection, prevention, &c.* (Parkh. Lex.) There was great pertinence in giving a name, from this root, to Moses; because *he interposed, intervened, mediated* between the king of Egypt and God. As God in plurality *interposed* in behalf of fallen man for *protection and prevention;* as the name of God, from this root, was used frequently, if not generally, in the plural number, there was a propriety in applying to Moses this name in the same number. The name was not designed to be significant of the *nature* of the Hebrew leader, but to express his *office and work*. A plural name of God is also given to Joseph by his brethren. But reasons similar to the foregoing will justify its application. This style is not peculiar to the Hebrew language. In the English tongue a similar dialect is used. Some of the names of God are applied to men; and the royal style is of plural number.

Names of plural number, applied to individual things, are not peculiar to the Hebrew language; nor do they invalidate the argument drawn from the plurality of the divine name. The same usage is known in our own language. Because some of our plural names are applied to singular things, it does not follow that there is not a peculiar significancy in the royal style. Because some Hebrew names of plural number are applied to individual things, it does not follow that

there is not a peculiar significancy in the plural name of God. Besides, those Hebrew plurals, applied to singulars, which have been offered to invalidate the argument of divine plurality, are of such a complex nature, or of such connexion, that they appear to contain or imply a plurality.

In Ps. 45:6, 7, the plural name of God is applied to the Son and to the Father. This, instead of proving that there is a plurality in each, serves to confirm the opinion that there is such a union between them, that the name of one may be applied to the other; and the plural name, embracing the Trinity, may be applied to the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit; for one implies the other.

"The ancient idolaters in general called the material heavens, or their representatives אלהים. And although the heavens are eminently distinguished into fire, light, and spirit, and many actions or operations are immediately performed by one or two of these, yet, as the whole celestial fluid acts jointly, or all its three conditions concur in every effect; hence it is that the ancient heathen called not only the whole heavens, but *any one* of its *three* conditions, denoted by a name expressive of some eminent operation it performs, אלהים. For they meant not to deny the joint action of the whole material Trinity, but to give it the glory of that particular attribute." Parkh. Lex. p. 20.

אלה signifies "a denouncing of a curse, a curse denounced either upon one's self or others, or both, so an oath taken or given." (Parkh. Lex. p. 18.) The plural of this word, applied to God, easily suggests the idea of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, entering into an oath, or covenant between themselves, and denouncing a curse on those, who continue not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. Besides, the Son himself was made a curse. In this view, the plural noun, אלהים has peculiar significance and pertinence.

ON THE FATHER.

When the doctrine of the Trinity is discussed, little is said distinctly respecting the Father. The cause of this neglect probably is, that all parties on this subject acknowledge that God is Father; and that the Father is God; and discussions respecting the nature of the Son imply the existence of the Father. But in taking a general view of the divine nature, as it is revealed, it is necessary to notice every character and office attached to it. The sacred scriptures represent the Father as having a distinct name, a distinct character, a distinct office. There is no reason that this part of the subject should be omitted.

God claims the relationship of Father to the human race. He is the Author of their beings; and on this gruond it is proper to call him their Father. The prophet Malachi saith, "A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master; if then I be *a Father*, where is mine honor, saith the Lord of hosts." Again he inquires, "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" Christ taught his disciples, saying, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father, which is in heaven, is perfect." Again he said, "Pray to thy Father, which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." The apostle Paul saith, "To us there is but one God, the Father." The phrase, "God the Father," is frequently used in the New Testament. When the title, Father, is applied to God, importing his relationship to the

human race, it does not designate distinction in the divine nature. Its import is, God in plurality. When Christ teaches us to pray, "Our Father, who art in heaven," he designs that we should address the one only living and true God without the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

God is in a more special manner, the Father of believers. He claims a nearer and more endearing relationship to them. He calls them children; he calls them sons. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the *sons* of God. Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the *sons* of God. Beloved, now are we the sons of God. Ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The union and affection, which subsist between them, are a just ground for giving them the appropriate names Father and sons. When God takes to himself the name Father in relation to the human race, or to believers, it is not designed to mark a distinction in his nature; but it conveys the idea of divine nature generally. The terms Father and God are frequently used as synonymous.

In all those divine works, which do not involve the work of redemption, God in plurality is brought to view. But when the work of redemption is exhibited, then the Trinity distinctly appears. When one of the sacred Three is exhibited, performing a certain part in the work of salvation, he takes the name of Father, not from the relationship, which he bears toward the human family; but from the relationship, which he bears toward the Son. In the divine nature and in the divine works there is perfect order. In divine offices there is priority and posteriority. By unanimous consent one of the Trinity holds the first place. By unanimous consent he holds authority over the Son, and over the Spirit. As a father is the head of his family, and holds the reins of authority, there appears to be propriety in calling *Him* Father,

who holds the first office in the work of redemption. The names of each of the Trinity are not of human invention. They are revealed. It may reasonably be expected that God would reveal himself by name or names of appropriate signification; that he would adopt language, which was calculated to convey some correct ideas of himself. When one of the Trinity calls himself Father, it is presumable that there is some analogy between himself and a human father. It is not supposable that any figurative language, or any representation taken from creatures can convey an adequate idea of the divine nature. There is no language, there is no representation, which can bring the infinitude of the Deity within the limits of finite understanding. But language and similitudes drawn from things, with which we are acquainted, help us to form some conception of the nature, character and offices, of the divine Being.

If one of the Trinity be called Father, in relation to Christ, it does not follow that he is his Father in the same sense, in which a man is father of his son. The scriptures abound with pertinent and forcible figures. If there be a striking analogy between the two relationships, there is propriety in calling him Father. It has been observed that the authority, which he holds over Jesus Christ, in the work of redemption, renders it proper that he should be called Father. If the manner of Christ's coming into the world; his introduction into office; his resurrection from the dead be reasons, for which he is called Son, the same reasons are valid for calling *him* Father, who sent him into the world, introduced him into office, and raised him from the dead. Between a father and son there is similarity of nature and nearness of relationship. Christ is of the same nature with him, who sent him. He perfectly harmonizes with him in all his designs, and in all his works. "What things soever he doth, (i. e. the Father) these also doeth the Son likewise." Christ calls God his Father. He expresses

their union in the strongest language. "I and my Father are one. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me." Christ is said to be in the bosom of the Father. These expressions designate the intimate union, which subsists between them; and shew the propriety in calling them by names, which express the nearest relationship.

A father feels a tender affection for his son. God expresses his great love for Christ. At his baptism he declared, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. The Father loveth the Son." God's love for the world is argued from his sending his only begotten Son into the world. If this be an expression of great love to the world, it follows that he exercised great love toward his Son. The great love which God had for Christ is another reason for calling himself his Father.

"A father frequently makes an only son heir of all he possesses. He, who sent Christ into the world hath appointed him heir of all things. He hath given him all authority. He hath given him dominion over all things in heaven and on earth. This is an additional reason for calling him the Father of Jesus Christ. By way of emphasis Christ is called *the* Son. By the same emphatical distinction he is called *the* Father.

It is impossible for finite minds to understand the union and the relationship, which subsists in the divine plurality. The scriptures, by a figure of speech, call Christ Son, and by the same figurative mode of expression they call him, who sent him, Father.

It is not necessary to quote texts of scripture and use arguments to prove the divinity of the Father. For those, who believe there is a God, believe that the Father is God. Besides, the scriptures frequently use the terms, Father and God, as synonymous.

In the covenant of redemption, ratified by the Father and the Son, it is stipulated, that the Son, in consideration for his sacrifice and mediation, "shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied." The

Father promised to him saying, "I will divide him a portion with the great; and he shall divide the spoil with the strong." The Father promised to give him the heathen, (i. e. the nations) for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; that he shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.

From Christ's own words it appears that the Father has given him a portion of the human race. In his prayer to the Father he saith, "I pray not for the world, but for them, which *thou hast given me.* Holy Father, keep through thine own name, *those, whom thou hast given me. Those, that thou gavest me I have kept. Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me be with me, where I am.*"

It belonged to the office of the Father to send the Son into the world. "God so loved the world that he sent his only begotten Son into the world." In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

The sending of the Holy Spirit is attributed to the Father. "How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things. When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father. Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

The Father is the object of Christ's intercession. "He made intercession for the transgressors." Who maketh intercession for us. We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous. Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven

itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." The intercessions of Christ are prevalent with the Father. "Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always." Christ intercedeth for those only, who are given him or are sanctified by the Spirit; and the Father is always ready to hear intercession for such.

Since the apostasy, the Father has holden intercourse with man, and man with the Father through the medium of the Son. When the Father reveals his will to man; when he confers his blessings, either temporal or spiritual, it is by or through the Son. When prayers are offered to our heavenly Father, they are offered in the name, or through the medium of the Son; and they become prevalent only by his intercession.

It was the office of the Father to send the Son into the world, to make a propitiation for sin; and to reconcile the world unto himself. He is well pleased with the righteousness of his Son; and he is well pleased with those, who are the objects of his intercessions.

It was the office of the Father to give all authority to the Son in his mediatorial capacity. When Christ has fulfilled the duties of his office as Mediator and Redeemer, and has judged the world, then will he give up the kingdom to God the Father. Then will the Father receive the authority which he had given to the Son; and God, without those distinctions, which were manifested during the economy of redemption, will be all in all.

The priority of the Father's office in the work of redemption is no proof of his superior nature, or that he is entitled to higher veneration than the Son or Spirit. In every work there is need of methodical arrangement. In the great and complex work of redemption there is the greatest need of method.

Where infinite wisdom operates there is order. If the Trinity hold respective offices in order, there is first, second, and third office. There is priority and posteriority. The dignity of their offices is not affected by their number. To human view, a sacrifice for sin is as important as the acceptance of the sacrifice; and qualifications to receive the benefit of it are as necessary as the sacrifice itself. Thus, Father, Son, and Spirit, hold offices equally essential to the work of redemption, and they claim equal love and veneration.

IN WHAT SENSE CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD.

PSALM 2:7. *Thou art my Son.* Jesus Christ is the Author of our holy religion. The communications, which were made to man after the apostasy, were made by him. By his authority holy men of God were inspired by the Holy Spirit; and communicated the divine will. By him the covenant of grace was given to degenerate man; and through his mediation, every favor is bestowed upon this fallen world. When fulness of time was come he appeared on earth in the form of human nature. He made more clear and copious displays of the divine will, than had been made before. He taught the way which led to heaven. He was embraced in the first promise of mercy to fallen humanity. He was the principal object of ancient prophecy. He was the substance, which was represented by the types in the Hebrew ritual. He was the antitype of the sacrifices, which were offered upon the Jewish altar. He is the main scope of the gospel. He is the foundation of salvation. He is the chief corner stone of the church.

As Jesus Christ holds so important a place in the scheme of redemption, it is necessary to form correct ideas of his nature, character and office. As he is the foundation of Christianity, the sentiments we form of him, will affect our whole creed respecting the method of salvation. It cannot be expected that the superstructure will be better than the basis. If we

begin with error, the whole fabric will be erroneous. View the Christian world, and it will be found that the sentiments they form of Christ give a complexion to their whole creed respecting Christianity. The greatest care ought, therefore, to be used in forming an opinion on this fundamental article of the Christian faith. It concerns us to decide whether Jesus Christ is simply human; whether he is a composition of human and super-angelic nature, or whether he is composed of humanity and Divinity. It is important to decide whether Christ exhibited characteristic marks of divine nature; and whether he sustains the office of Mediator, Redeemer and Savior. The importance of the subject demands a faithful investigation.

When Christ appeared in the world, it was a prominent inquiry among the Jews whether he was the Son of God. The inquiries whether he was the Christ, or whether he was the Son of God were of the same import. They expected that when the promised Messiah appeared, he would appear in the character of God's Son. In the Old Testament God acknowledges him to be his Son. By his prophet he said, "Thou art my Son." Jewish authors admit that the term Son in the 2d Psalm is applied to Christ. To put the question beyond dispute the apostle Paul quotes this short passage, and applies it to Christ. When Jesus claimed the title, Son of God, and the title, Christ, the Jews considered him claiming the same prerogatives. At one time they accused him of calling himself Christ. At another time they accused him of calling himself the Son of God; and they viewed the accusations of the same import.

Christ once inquired of his disciples what was the opinion of people respecting himself. After they had named several opinions, which were entertained of him, he inquired of them saying, "Whom say *ye* that I am?" Peter, who was always ready to give an answer, said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the

living God." Jesus replied, "Blessed art thou Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee; but my Father, which is in heaven." This reply proved that Peter had formed right ideas of him; and gave him an appropriate name. Jesus Christ was predicted by the name, Son. When he came into the world he maintained that he was the Son of God. When he was on trial before the council, the high Priest adjured him by the living God, that he should declare whether he was the Christ, the Son of God. When the Centurion saw the miracles at his crucifixion, he exclaimed, "Surely this was the Son of God." The apostles preached the same doctrine. After Saul was converted to the Christian faith, he "straightway preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God." Evil spirits acknowledged the same sentiment; and gave him the same title. The relationship of Christ to the Father expressed by the term Son was acknowledged by himself; by his apostles; and by primitive Christians.

Soon after Christ left the world, various opinions arose respecting him. Some believed that he was wholly divine; that he assumed only the *appearance* of humanity. Some held that a super-angelic nature was united with his human nature. Others maintained that he was a mere man, furnished with extraordinary communications. This variety of sentiment respecting Jesus Christ early disturbed and divided the Christian Church. The same distinctions, with their various modifications, have perpetuated divisions in the Christian world.

The phrase, Son of God, is often applied in the scriptures to Jesus Christ. He frequently claims this dignity. The Father often calls him his Son; his own Son; his dearly beloved Son. Scripture names are remarkable for their pertinence; and there is no doubt that a peculiar and appropriate sense is to be attached to this title. It is important to inquire in what sense Christ is the Son of God.

This appellation was given to individuals of the human race. Adam was called the son of God. When God sent Moses to Pharaoh, requiring him to let Israel go, he commanded him to say unto Pharaoh, "Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son. When God forbade David to build an house for his name, he declared that Solomon should build him an house; and "I will be his *Father* and he shall be my Son; and I will establish his kingdom." Those, who are born of the Spirit and have become members of Christ's kingdom, are frequently called *sons* of God. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." People are children of God in different senses, and in different respects. All are his children in this general sense, that he is the Author of their existence; and in this sense all may call him Father. But those, who are renewed in the temper of their minds, and are adopted into his family, are, in a more peculiar sense, his children, or his sons; and in a more peculiar sense God is their Father.

Christ is not only Son of God, but by way of distinction and eminence, he is *the Son* of God. If those, who are born of the Holy Spirit; who bear the divine moral likeness, and have become members of God's family by adoption, are emphatically sons of God; for greater reasons, and in a higher sense is Jesus Christ *the* Son of God.

Some are of opinion that the sonship of Christ originated from his miraculous conception. To Mary the angel said, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee; and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; *therefore* also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." It is not doubted that this is one reason, for which he was called by this name. But it is not the only, nor the principal reason for giving him this appellation. Christ was called a Son long before his incarnation. The Psalmist

speaking the language of the Father to Christ, saith, "Thou art my Son." The love of God is represented in the highest degree because he *sent* his Son into the world. The love of God is grounded on his not sparing his own, his dearly beloved Son; but giving him up freely for the sins of the world. If God had not had a Son before the advent of the Messiah, he could not have *sent* his *Son*. Therefore the peculiar manner of his introduction into the world did not constitute his near relationship to the Father.

Christ is not a *literal* Son of the Father. Because Christ is repeatedly called Son of God, it does not follow that this phrase is to be understood according to its literal, or natural meaning. If it should be admitted as an established rule for the interpretation of the scriptures that words are always to be understood according to their natural meaning, and according to their general acceptation, there would be found something more than *mystery* in the Bible. If the terms Son of God prove that Jesus Christ is *literally* and *properly* the Son of the most High, then the terms Lamb of God would prove that Christ was *literally* and *properly* a *lamb;* and as he was *of* God, it would prove that God possessed the same nature. The scriptures say, "it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth; The Lord repented of the evil, which he thought to do unto his people; God repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them and he did it not." If these passages are to be understood according to the rule of literal interpretation, or according to the *common acceptation* of words, then God is changeable like man; and feels the painful emotions of humanity. God is represented in the scriptures as hearing, seeing, smelling. If these terms are to be explained by the rule just mentioned, then the divine Spirit is invested with a body; and possesses corporeal organs. Such interpretations prove that the rule is not correct; and it proves also that Christ is not *literally* the Son of God, merely because he is called by this name.

Christ is not the Son of God by *derivation.* Creation and derivation are words of different import; and they require different acts of power. Creation is the production of something out of nothing. Derivation is the production of something from something already existing. Matter was created. The human body was derived from this substance. The human race have derived their nature ultimately from the parents of all living. All the properties of their natures are similar to those of their progenitors. If their parents had a beginning of existence, if they were dependent and were limited in all their faculties, their descendants are exactly like them in all these particulars. The nature they derived is exactly similar to that, from which they derived it. A stream is of the same nature as its fountain. Every production is of the same nature, i. e. possesses the same essential properties, as those from which they are produced. In this manner derivation applies to almost every thing, which falls under our notice.

If Christ *derived* his nature from the Father, he possesses the same kind of nature, the same essential properties, which the Father possesses. If the Father be eternal, self-existent, independent, infinite in power, knowledge and wisdom, the derived Son must also be eternal, self-existent, independent, infinite in power, knowledge and wisdom. This derived Being is a distinct and separate existence from the Father. As he possesses all divine attributes, he is a divine Being. As he possesses a nature separate from, and independent of, the Father, he and the Father are two distinct gods. As this natural conclusion is false, it is presumed that the doctrine of divine derivation is not true.

It is in vain to say, all divine attributes may be derived except eternity and self-existence. If the Son, by derivation be divine, he possesses divine attributes. If he possess not divine attributes, he is not divine. Take from him any one divine property, and

his divinity ceases. Take from him his eternity and self-existence, and it is harder to conceive of his divinity, than it is to conceive of a plurality in the divine nature. It is hard to conceive divine attributes blended in the same nature with finite properties. It is hard to conceive almighty power in a dependent existence; to conceive infinite knowledge, or any other quality infinite in its nature, subsisting in a nature, which has had a *temporary* existence.

When creatures receive existence by *derivation*, they, from whom they are derived, communicate a portion of their own substance. They suffer a diminution of themselves; and the diminution would continue, if they did not receive supplies, from external substance. If Christ *derived* his nature from the Father, the Father communicated a part of his own nature, a part of his own substance. He would suffer a privation of a part of his attributes, a part of his nature. There would be a chasm in the divine Spirit, which could not be filled. There would be an essential defect in the Father. The derived extract would be dependent; and the original Source of being would be diminished. Of course, the Son would be a dependent, and the Father a finite being.

Divine nature, or divine attributes are not communicable. God cannot *impart* one quality of his mind; nor can one divine quality be *derived* from him. If a human or an angelic spirit be produced, it is the *effect* of divine energy; it is not a communication of divine qualities. A created mind is similar, in some respects, to the divine Mind; but, in degree, it bears no comparison. Holiness in the human heart is not a derivation of divine holiness; but it is the *effect* of divine operation upon the mind. There is an essential difference between originating existence, and communicating that which already exists.

The divine nature is eternal; and it is necessary in its existence. As it had no cause of its existence, there is no cause, which can destroy its existence. As

it is impossible that it should not exist, it is impossible that it should exist otherwise than it does. If its attributes are infinite, it is impossible it should exist with a diminution or relinquishment of any of its attributes. It is not derogatory to the Deity, to be incapable of change; to be incapable of imperfection. Admitting these principles, it is impossible that God should communicate his nature or his attributes; and it is equally impossible that they should be *derived* from him. Should he communicate almighty power, infinite wisdom, infinite knowledge and independence, he would become entirely *destitute* of these attributes. Or rather, a transference of divine attributes, (supposing it possible) would not destroy them; and being again united, they would constitute the same divine Being; and of course there would be no communication, nor derivation. If it be supposed that Jesus Christ derived divine attributes from the Father in only a limited degree, the supposition is inconsistent. In the first place, divine nature is incapable of division, or separation, or of communication of any part of itself. In the second place, if a partial communication were made, the consequence would be different from that, which is contemplated by the supposition. If it were possible that Christ derived a finite nature and finite attributes from the Father, he would not be divine. There is no perceptible difference between finite properties and the properties of creatures. Divine attributes are infinite; or they are in the highest possible degree. Attributes less than these are not divine. Should we speak of divine, dependent power; of a divine, finite knowledge; of a divine, limited presence; of a divine, temporary existence; we should pervert, we should torture language. If we had ideas on this subject, it is certain that such a combination, such a contrariety of words would not convey them.

If Christ has his nature by *derivation* from the Father, there was a period in eternity, in which he had not existence. It was owing to the will of the

Father that he was brought into being. It is, of course, owing to his will that he is continued in existence. For the same power, which produced him, can return him to his original state. He is, consequently, entirely dependent on the Father. If he be not eternal; if he be not independent, it is impossible he should possess other divine attributes. It is a contradiction to say that a dependent being possesses almighty power. It appears to be impossible that a being of only a temporary existence should possess infinite knowledge. It is impossible there should be infinite wisdom where knowledge is limited. A dependent being cannot be, in his own nature, unchangeable. Within these limitations it is impossible that a being should be omnipresent, and be capable of holding the reins of universal government. After the closest investigation of the nature of a Son, derived from the Father, (if such a thing were possible) it will clearly appear that he has not one divine attribute, nor the least degree of divine nature.

It is in vain to attempt to supply the innate deficiency of this *derived* Son, by *constituting* him God's agent, and by anointing him with the Spirit without measure; and by investing him with divine fulness. If Christ was only appointed or *constituted* Creator of the world; if the Father employed him as an instrument, through whom *he* exercised his own power, Christ was not the *actual* Creator of the world; and the glory of the work would not be due to him. If Christ was *constituted* a Prince; and he was a Prince on this ground only, he had no native regal dignity, nor regal authority. He acted only under a commission; and he, who granted the commission could, at any time, withdraw it. This constituted agent would not be entitled to those honors, to which the Father, who constituted him, would be entitled. There would be the same difference in their claims, as there would be in the claims of an actor and an instrument. If his claims to princely honors rise *solely* from God's

requiring that they should honor the Son even as they honor the Father, it is difficult to understand in what sense God is jealous for the honor of his name; and that he will not give his glory to another. If Christ is Judge, only because he is *constituted* to that office, then he does not possess inherent qualifications for that station, he is merely the organ, through which the Father acts; and the judgment rendered is not properly that of the Son, but that of the Father. If Christ is a Savior, merely on the ground of a *constituted character*, or *merely* because he was appointed to that office, he would be only an *ostensible* Savior; the Father would be the *real* Savior.

If the Son was divine, on the ground of his *derivation* from the Father, there would be no need of *constituting* him to fill divine offices; to sustain divine titles; to perform divine works. There would be no need of making divine communications to him for these purposes. He would be competent in his own nature to fill the highest offices; to claim the highest honors; and to do the greatest works. If extraordinary divine communications are necessary to qualify him for these things, it follows that he is not divine.

If Christ's superior excellence and dignity arises not from his nature, but from the communications, which the Father made to him, it is difficult to draw a line of distinction between him and the prophets. God endued Moses with an extraordinary degree of power, by which he exhibited signs and wonders before Pharaoh. But who *actually* wrought these miracles? When God called Moses to send him to the king of Egypt; and he hesitated to go, God said unto him, "I will stretch out *my* hand and smite Egypt with all *my* wonders, which *I* will do in the midst thereof." The power, which God communicated to Moses for this purpose, did not become a property of Moses' nature, any more than it became the property of the rod, which he carried, *wherewith*, God said, he should do signs. Moses never pretended to act by his own

strength in his exhibition of miracles, excepting at the rock in Horeb; and there he greatly displeased the Lord. When Elijah restored to life a dead child of the woman with whom he abode, he did not attempt the undertaking in his own name, nor by his own might. But "he cried unto the Lord and said, O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah, and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." Before Elisha raised the child of the Shunammite, he prayed unto the Lord. When Peter was about to give health to a sick man, he said, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole." When he cured a lame man, he said, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk." Before he raised Tabitha from the dead, he kneeled down and prayed. These were wonderful works, which God wrought through them. They professed to act *under* authority; and they refused divine honors when they were offered to them.

If Christ was endued with divine fulness in a similar manner, it might be expected that his miracles would be attended with similar circumstances. When Christ turned water into wine, he addressed no superior power. When he healed the impotent man at the pool, he simply said, "rise, take up thy bed, and walk." When Jesus gave sight to a blind man, he applied clay to his eyes; and sent him to the pool of Siloam. When he healed a man of the leprosy he said, "I will, be thou clean." When he cured a man of the palsy, he said, "arise and take up thy couch and go unto thine house." The other miraculous cures, which he effected, he accomplished in a similar manner. When he raised the widow's son of Nain, he only said, "Young man, I say unto thee, arise." Before he raised Lazarus from the grave he addressed the Father. But for what purpose did he address him? Was it that the Father would put forth his power through him? Christ assigns the reason himself;

"because of the people which stand by I said it." He then cried with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth."

The circumstances attending the miracles, which he wrought, did not give the least appearance that he acted by power, which was not properly his own. When, in consequence of divine works, divine honors were addressed to him, he never refused them, nor rebuked his worshippers. When people heard his instructions they "were astonished at his doctrine; for he taught them as one *having authority*." The prophets never pretended that they were the *authors* of divine works; and they never claimed divine honors. If the Son had performed divine works, only by the intervention of the Father's power operating through him, he would be no more entitled to divine names and divine homage than the prophets.

It has been supposed that, because the Father hath *given* all things into the hand of his Son; because God hath exalted and glorified him; because God hath put all things under his feet and exalted him with his own right hand to be a Prince and a Savior; because God ordained him to be Judge of quick and dead; because God created the world by him and *sent* him into the world, Christ is inferior to the Father; that he is of a lower nature than the Father; that he has no claims to divinity excepting on the ground of a *constituted character*, or by the reception of divine fulness. This sentiment arises from not making a distinction between the Son's nature and the offices which he sustains.

Had there been no apostasy; had no projection of a method of salvation been made and put in operation, it is probable the divine plurality would never have been manifested. In the scheme of redemption the distinctions in the divine nature are brought into view, and into distinct operation. In this great work there is perfect arrangement; there is perfect order. In respect to office there is priority and posteriority. In respect to authority and works there is subordination. The Father sends the Son; the Son sends the

Holy Spirit. It is the office of the Father to *send.* The offices of the Son and of the Holy Spirit require that they should be *sent.* They fill as important offices in the work of salvation as the Father; and they appear no less glorious in their offices, than the Father does in his. The glories of divine nature shine in each. Subordination in the work of redemption is one of its divine perfections; and it argues nothing against the divinity of the Son; it is not derogatory to his nature or character that he manifests this perfection.

Some names and works are attributed exclusively to the Father, and others are attributed exclusively to the Son. This does not appear strange, when it is considered that they had different offices, and had different parts to perform in the work of salvation. As the Father holds a precedence in respect to office, it is not surprising that those names and works, which have an immediate relation to his office, should appear to have a preeminence over the names and works, which have an immediate relation to the Son's office. The Father is called, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;" Eph. 1:3. and 1 Pet. 1:3. He is called the Head of Christ. "The Head of every man is Christ—and the Head of Christ is God;" 1 Cor. 11:3. The Son is called "the only begotten of the Father;" John 1:14. He is called "the image of the invisible God;" Col. 1:15. He is called Mediator. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;" 1 Tim. 2:5. To infer from these names of the Son that his nature is inferior to the nature of the Father is not logical. The name Father is more dignified than the name Son. But who ever supposed that the nature of a father was essentially different from, or superior to, that of his son? The *man* Christ Jesus had a Head, a God, as well as other men; even the Father. His office required subordination. Because the Son is called the *image* of the invisible God, it does not fol-

low that his nature is inferior. It is common language to say, one person is the very image of another. But this expression is never understood to mean that he, who is called the image, is inferior to him, of whom he is the image. The name, or the office of Mediator does not necessarily imply that he, who acts in this office, is inferior to either party, between whom he mediates. There is no higher name given to the Deity than the name Jehovah. This name is given to the Son. It is believed that the unqualified name Jehovah is not given to any creature. If there be any proof of divinity from a name, the Son has as high proof as the Father.

Some works are peculiar to the Father. Others are peculiar to the Son. This is not strange, as they hold different offices. The Father *begat* the Son. "This day have *I begotten* thee;" Ps. 2:7. The Father *sent* the Son into the world. He *gave* him all authority in heaven and in earth. He hath *highly exalted* him. Christ *was begotten.* He came into the world and assumed human nature. "The Word was made flesh;" John 1:14. He humbled, or emptied himself. He died; rose, ascended to the Father; and makes intercession. He made an atonement for sin.

We are taught by the word of inspiration in what sense the Father begat the Son. "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, *in that he hath raised up Jesus again*, as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;" Acts 13:13. This act of begetting, therefore, relates only to the *body* of Jesus Christ. Nothing, of course, can be inferred from this respecting that nature of his, which had glory with the Father before the world was.

The act of sending does not imply that he, who sends, possesses a higher nature than the one who was sent. It only designates superiority of office. The chief magistrate of a nation *sends* an ambassador to a foreign court. This act affords no evidence that

the former possesses a nature superior to the latter; or that he possesses higher qualifications. It only proves his higher office. All things were *delivered* unto Christ by the Father. All authority in heaven and in earth were *given* to him. This communication does not imply an imparting of any qualities or qualifications to him. It rather implies that he possessed the necessary qualifications for this office. It is not difficult to imagine what qualifications are necessary in order to exercise all authority in heaven and in earth. To *receive* this authority only implies a subordination of office.

Because Christ was *exalted* by the Father, it has been inferred that he was not divine, as Divinity is not capable of exaltation. The man Christ Jesus receives great reward, great honor, great *exaltation* in consequence of the part he performed on earth. He is seated on the right hand of God. If it be admitted that the Son of God was in a state of humiliation when he was upon earth; that he emptied himself of that glory, which he had with the Father before the world was, there will be no difficulty in admitting his *exaltation*, when he returns to his former glory; and as Savior receives the bowing of every knee, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth; and the confession of every tongue that he is Lord. Such is the union of nature and connexion of office between the Son and the Father, that this *exaltation*, this glory of the Son will also be "to the glory of God the Father."

The peculiar union of the Son of God with humanity affords no evidence against his Divinity. While he was in the man Christ Jesus, he concealed, in a great measure, the glories of his nature; and he suffered a reproach, an ignominy, which before had not been given him. But this concealment of his glory, this dishonor offered to him does not imply a change in his nature. If a king descend from his throne, assume the *appearance* of one of his subjects, and receive rude

treatment from them, these circumstances effect no change in his nature, nor do they imply it. We do not attempt to explain the union, which subsists between the Son of God and the son of man. When those, who maintain that God the Father was *in* Jesus Christ; that the fulness of the Godhead, which dwelt bodily in him was the Father, not the Son, will explain that union of Deity with humanity, their explanation will answer our purpose as well as theirs.

If Adam could with propriety be called Son of God, with the same propriety could Christ, in respect to his human nature, be called Son of God. Adam was formed by the immediate act of divine power. The child Jesus was also formed by the immediate act of the same power. But in a different, and in a higher sense is Christ the Son of God. He is not only called Son, but he is called the *own* Son; the dearly beloved Son; the first begotten, the only begotten Son. These additions to his name are marks of peculiar distinction.

The term son, when applied to Adam, in relation to his heavenly Father, has a signification different from what it has, when applied to any of the human race, in relation to their earthly parents. If the relative term son, necessarily implied *derived* existence, then the first man as literally derived his nature from the substance of God, as children derive their natures from the substance of their parents. But a word does not always signify the same thing. Sometimes it is used in an extensive, sometimes in a restricted sense. Sometimes it is used literally, sometimes figuratively. When a word is used figuratively, there is a resemblance between the thing signified by it literally, and the thing signified by it figuratively. When God is called a rock, the propriety of the figure arises from some points of resemblance between God and a rock. The qualities of this hard substance are expressive of the steadfastness and durability of the divine nature. Christ is called a shield. This piece

of armor was formerly used in war to secure the body from the weapons of the enemy. Christ is a defence against the attacks of the great adversary. The Savior is called a vine. A vine has many branches, and it supports them all. The Savior has many members, and they all derive support from him. Christ is called a shepherd. A shepherd feeds and defends his flock. Christ feeds his followers with spiritual food; and he defends them against the attacks of their enemies. Many other names are figuratively applied to Christ. Because he is called a Shield, a Vine, a Shepherd, it does not follow that he is literally a shield, a vine, a shepherd. The propriety and force of these appellations arise from some striking resemblance there is between the Savior and those things, by whose name he is called. Figurative language is peculiarly significant and striking. When it is wished to convey ideas of an object, with which people are but little acquainted, no method is so concise and eligible, as to compare it with something, or call it by a name, with which people are acquainted. Then, by selecting the most prominent qualities of the best known part of the comparison, they may be applied to that part of the comparison, which is less known. By this method ideas are frequently conveyed with greater clearness and force. When Christ wished to impress it upon the minds of people that he pointed out the course, which led to heaven; that only through his merits and mediation mankind could have access to the mercy-seat; that he communicates only truth; that he was the origin and support of spiritual life in the soul, it was with peculiar pertinence and force he said, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life."

It may be inquired how it can be known when a passage of scripture is to be understood literally, and when it is to be understood figuratively. Without giving any general directions in answer to this inquiry, it is sufficient for the present purpose to lay down one particular rule; viz. if any text or expression of scrip-

ture, taken literally, be an impossibility or an absurdity, it must be taken figuratively. For example, "If any man come to me, and *hate* not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." As it is impossible that a real hating of these near connexions should be a necessary ingredient in the character of Christ's disciples, the word *hate*, must be understood in a comparative or figurative sense. The phrase, Son of God, cannot be understood in a literal sense; because it is impossible that God should have a Son derived from his nature, as a child is derived from its parents. It is impossible that divine nature, and divine attributes should be communicated, unless the original proprietor sustained a loss of them. It is impossible there should be two separate and distinct divine natures, without admitting the existence of two gods. If the expression, Son of God, cannot be taken literally, it must be taken figuratively.

As Christ is called the Son of God, as he cannot be his literal and proper Son, it may be expected there is a striking resemblance between the relationship, which Jesus Christ bears to the Father, and the relationship, which a son bears to his parents. Although we cannot comprehend the *mode* of divine subsistence, yet there are points of coincidence in the comparison, which give beauty and force to the figure.

1. There is a similarity of nature between a son and his father. There is often a family likeness. A son often inherits the aspect of his father. He often inherits the distinguishing characteristics of body and mind, which his father possessed. His moral nature and character often resemble those of his father. Though there be some dissimilarity between a father and his son; yet there are probably no two objects in the rational world, which sustain a more striking resemblance. Their bodies are of similar substance and of similar configuration. Their minds are of similar natures, and of similar powers and faculties.

The resemblance there is between a son and his father, is one reason why Christ is called *Son* of God; and that God is called his Father. His nature is similar to that of the Father. By this expression it is not designed to convey the idea that the Son and Father are two distinct natures; nor is it designed to convey the idea that the Son is the Father, and the Father is the Son. Like the Father, the Son is divine. Like the Father, he is eternal, self-existent, and independent. There is a perfect resemblance between them; and there is a mysterious union, by which many things may be predicated of both. This striking similarity is one reason why Christ is called Son of God.

2. There is a near and endearing *relationship* subsisting between a son and his father. The former proceeded from the latter. There is no relationship more near and endearing than this. This then is another reason why Jesus Christ is called the Son of God. The union, which subsists between them, forms a relationship, which is nearer than any, which can be formed by flesh and blood. He is in the bosom of the Father; he is one with the Father; they, who have seen him, have seen the Father also. Mutual affection subsists between them.

3. A son, while under the care and support of his father, is *subordinate* to him. He is not subordinate in respect to nature. For he possesses all the essential qualities, which his father possesses. But he is in subjection to him. He submits to parental authority; and he appears to the greatest advantage when he is in his proper place, the place of obedience. Christ may, with propriety be called a Son, in respect to his *subordination* to his heavenly Father. In the economy of redemption different works are to be performed; different offices are to be occupied. Methodical arrangement must be established and acknowledged. The Father holds the place of authority; Christ holds the place of submission. This order of offices implies

no arbitrary power, nor servile subjection. It is established with the greatest cordiality. It is the office of the Father to appoint; it is the office of Christ to act under his commission. It is the office of Christ to ask, and it is the office of the Father to grant his requests. The Father is under as much obligation, according to the covenant of redemption, to grant the intercessions of his Son, as the Son is to submit to the authority of the Father. The sacred scriptures represent the Holy Spirit to be as subordinate to the Son, as the Son is to the Father. Christ said to his disciples, "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, *I will send him* unto you."

4. A father loves his son. The similarity of nature, the relationship, and the subordination, produce a strong affection in a father's breast. God the Father loves the Lord Jesus Christ. He loves him for his excellence of nature. He loves him for his holiness. He loves him for his union with himself. He loves him for the faithful performance of the duties of his office. The Father has declared him to be his own Son; his dearly beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased. The love, which he exercises toward him is another reason, for which he calls him his Son.

Christ is not only called a Son, but he is called a begotten Son. People, who have understood the term Son, literally, have also understood the term beget, or begotten, literally. They have supposed there was a power in the Father to generate, and a power in the Son to be generated. They were aware that this method, if it were not qualified, supposed a posteriority of existence in the Son. To remedy this difficulty they maintained that the essence of the Son was not begotten; but his *person* was begotten. The distinction between his nature and person, they made to consist in something, which was incommunicable from the Father to the Son, or from the Son to

the Father. They held, that the Father had a power to beget, and the Son had a power to be begotten.

There appears to be no small degree of inconsistency in this hypothesis. It supposes that there is no other difference between the Father and the Son, than this; the Father had a power to beget. But what did he beget? He begat the *person* of the Son; i. e. according to the hypothesis, he begat a power in the Son to be begotten. The hypothesis first supposes the existence of the Son; then it supposes the production of some distinguishing personal quality, which he already possessed. Or it supposes that he possesses some adventitious quality, for which he was entirely dependent. To avoid the imputation of dependence to Christ, they maintained the eternal generation of the Son. Thus they secured their sentiment from refutation in the obscurity of language.

The human nature of Christ was begotten; but his divine nature was unbegotten. The Son of God was always the same in his nature and attributes, and in his union and relationship to his heavenly Father. In a figurative sense he might be said to be begotten, when he actually came into the office of Redeemer; received mediatorial authority, and became submissive to God the Father. He might be said to be begotten, when he was manifested on earth in the office of Redeemer; and by the name, Son of God. Those are said to be begotten, who are brought out of one state into another. Paul to the Corinthians says, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." To Philemon he says, "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds." Christ may be said to be begotten by his resurrection from the dead. By this act he was more fully declared to the world than he before had been. Before this time, even his disciples were exceedingly ignorant of him; the design of his coming, and the nature of his kingdom. By his resurrection his own prophecy was

fulfilled, and he was in a capacity for making more full displays of the divine will by making more copious communications of the Holy Spirit. The apostle Paul appears to have viewed the resurrection of Christ in this light when he said to the Jews, "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." The circumstances attending Christ in his introduction into office; his introduction into the world; his resurrection from the dead, are similar in some respects to the production of a human son. The circumstances are so analogous that there is a foundation for calling Christ a begotten Son.

Christ is also called the *only begotten Son.* By the law of analogy there is a striking propriety in this expression. In his human nature no one was ever so begotten as he was. In his divine nature no one ever sustained those offices; that intimate union and near relationship to the Father, which he sustained. Parents often feel an extraordinary affection for an only, or an only begotten son. When God required Abraham to offer Isaac in sacrifice, he commanded him saying, take now thy son, thine *only* son. The apostle, speaking of the faith of Abraham, calls Isaac his only begotten son. At that time Abraham had another, and an older son. But he had an extraordinary affection for this younger son; and on account of this strong affection, God called him his only son; and by the mouth of his apostle he called him his only begotten son. There is analogy in nature, therefore, for calling Christ the *only begotten Son* of God. The Father loves him with an everlasting love. He loves him for the excellence of his nature, and for the fulfilment of the duties of his offices. No language was better calculated to convey the idea of God's great love to Christ than this.

Christ is repeatedly called in the scriptures the *first born, the first begotten.* This language is also figura-

tive. The propriety and force of this figure arise from the peculiar prerogatives of the first born of God's ancient chosen people. The first born was principal heir of his father's substance. He had dominion over his brethren. Isaac, in blessing Jacob, said, "Be lord over thy brethren; and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee." It was the privilege of the first born to have the priest's office. In all these respects there is such a similarity between the prerogatives of the first born and the prerogatives of Christ, that there is a peculiar propriety in calling him the *first born.* God hath appointed him heir of all things. Christ is said to be the first born among many brethren, denoting he has dominion over them. It is written, that the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment; that all power is given to him in heaven and in earth. He performed the duties of a priest. He was formally consecrated to the priest's office. He made intercession for the people, and offered sacrifice for their sins.

Christ is called the first born of every creature. Some have understood by this that he is the first created being. It has been shewn in what sense he is the first born; and it appears that in all things he has the preeminence. Besides, the original, from which this passage is translated, might with equal propriety be rendered, *born before every creature.* Christ is likewise the first born, the first begotten from the dead. He is called the first fruits of them that slept. Christ was first born from the dead in respect to his dignity. He was Lord of the dead. Never did the tomb hold so glorious a prisoner. Never did such circumstances attend the resurrection of any other. This holy One did not see corruption. His resurrection was first, or he was the first born from the dead, inasmuch as his resurrection proved, and was the procuring cause of the resurrection of those, who had been, or would be, under the dominion of death. "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; but now

is Christ risen and become the first fruits of them that slept."

In the writings of the Old Testament God called Christ *the Son*, and *my Son*. From these expressions the Jews expected that the Messiah was the Son of God; and it appears they expected he would appear with that title, and in that character. Although Jesus Christ was somewhat obscurely revealed under the Jewish dispensation; yet the phrase, *the Son*, *my Son*, had, in their opinion, a peculiar and appropriate meaning, a meaning different from the term son, when applied to any of the human race.

The Jews, in consequence of the revelations, which they possessed, expected a glorious personage in the Messiah. Had their expectations been realised in respect to his appearance, it seems, according to human calculation, that they would have acknowledged him to be the Messiah; that they would not have been offended, if he had claimed the title, Son of God. But when they saw his humble appearance; when they saw his object was different from what they expected, they viewed him as a mere man. When he called God his Father; when he called himself the Son of God, they considered him making pretensions to divinity; assuming the place of the Messiah; and making himself equal with God. They supposed the title implied divine nature. They, of course, considered him blasphemous when he made such pretensions. As he did not correct them for error in their construction of the title Son of God, it is presumable they put a right construction upon it.

Because a son signifies a natural descendant from parents, it does not follow that the divine Son is a natural descendant from his heavenly Father. We often reason from one thing to another. But the rules of analogy are of limited extent; and they are greatly confined in their application. There is a resemblance and proportion between different things in some particulars. But beyond a certain extent resemblance

and proportion fail. There is a resemblance between a man and a brute. Their bodies are material, and they are both sensitive. But, because the rational principle in man is capable of improvement, it does not follow that the instinct of brutes possesses the same capacity. Because the bodies of both are mortal, it does not follow that both will be reorganized and reanimated. The human mind bears some resemblance to the divine mind. It was formed after its likeness. But there is no proportion between what is finite and what is infinite. Because God has given a power to human nature to produce and perpetuate its kind, it follows, God has a power to produce the same kind. The inference is corroborated by the fact, that he did originally produce it. But from these premises it does not follow that he has a power to produce a divine species. No rules of logic, no analogy of nature will justify such an inference. It is a natural impossibility that infinite power should produce infinite power; that an eternal Being should produce an eternal Being; that self-existence should produce self-existence. Because this confounds cause and effect. It is a natural impossibility that a divine nature should not have divine attributes. Because a nature is designated by its attributes. It is a natural impossibility that divine attributes should be limited by any thing foreign from their own nature. Because it is the prerogative of divine attributes that they have no superior. As far as there are points of likeness and proportion between things there is analogy; and so far analogical reasoning may be used, and no further.

To obviate the sentiment that Christ is Son of God by derivation, it is not necessary to have recourse to the peculiar mode of the conception of his humanity as a *primary reason* of his sonship. Without doubt this is one reason, for which he is called Son of God; but for other and more important reasons he is called *the* Son of God, the first begotten, the only begotten, the dearly beloved, the own Son. If the humanity of

Christ was the principal ground of calling him Son of God, then Adam was Son of God in as high sense as Christ; for his nature was no less the immediate effect of God's power than the humanity of Jesus Christ. The angels, being of a more exalted nature than humanity, they would be sons of God in a higher sense than the human nature of Christ. When the apostle Paul to the Hebrews describes the excellence of Christ, and contrasts him with angels, he infers his superiority from this circumstance, that God called him his Son; but never gave this distinguishing appellation to them; and that he promises to be to him a Father, and that he should be to him a Son. Because this promise is in future tense, it does not follow that his humanity is the *primary ground* of his sonship, or that his sonship originated with his incarnation. As he had not been clearly manifested to the world by that name and in that relationship to the Father before this prediction, it was proper, in view of the manifestation of him as Son in the flesh to make the promise in future time, although the relationship then actually existed. After God delivered Israel from Egyptian bondage, he promised them saying, I *will* walk among you; and *will* be your God; and ye *shall* be my people. This promise is in future time; but who doubts that God walked among them at that time; and at that time he was their God and that they were his people? As the relationship was to continue, it was proper to make the declaration in future tense. As the relationship between the Father and the Son was permanent, it was no less proper to declare it in future than in present time.

"Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." If God's declaration to Christ that he would be his Father and that Christ would be his Son, must necessarily be taken in future tense, this declaration of the Psalmist must, by the same necessity, be taken in the present tense. It would, of course, follow that the Son was begotten at the time the Psalm, containing

this declaration, was written. But in prophetic language it is not uncommon that one tense is put for another. The prophet Isaiah described the sufferings of the Messiah many centuries before he suffered, in the present, and in the past tense. The prophetic writings, and the peculiar idiom of the Hebrew language admit some variation of tense. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." The apostle Paul does not consider this passage to have relation to the *nativity* of Jesus, but to his *resurrection.* In his address to the men of Israel he said, "We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise, which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children in that *he hath raised up Jesus again*, as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." It appears, of course, that, when Christ is called the first begotten, the only begotten Son, these terms do not designate the origin of his human nature, but are applied to him in a higher and in a more distinguishing sense. The apostle Paul to the Romans, speaking of Christ says, "Declared to be *the Son of God* with power according to the Spirit of holiness, *by the resurrection from the dead.*" He is also called "the first born from the dead." Hence it follows that the terms begotten and born when applied to Christ are not always to be understood literally; that they do not always apply to his nativity.

The discourse, which Gabriel had with Mary, has, more than once, been used to prove that the filiation of Christ originated from his incarnation. "The angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, *therefore*, *also*, that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The holy thing, which was to be born of Mary, was the holy Child Jesus. This Child was called the Son of God. Christ was called the Son of God, the first begotten, the only begotten Son; when the Father

declared, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." These distinguishing and endearing appellations were not applied exclusively to the humanity of Christ. They were applied to him when Divinity and humanity were united. If the humanity of Christ sustained a nearer relationship to the Father than his Divinity, there would be ground for applying the terms, importing the nearest relationship, primarily to his human nature. But as there is not that nearness of relationship between God and a creature that there is in the divine nature, it is presumable that those appellations, which import the nearest relationship, were applied primarily to that nature of Christ, which bore the nearest relationship to the Father. Consequently they could not have a primary reference to his humanity. So intimate was the union between the Divinity and humanity of Christ, that it is not doubted that the name Son might with propriety, be applied to either nature distinctly or to both natures conjointly; and at the same time primary reference be made to his divine nature.

The apostle to the Galatians, speaking of Christ, says, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman; made under the law, to redeem them that are under the law." This text does not teach *how* Christ became God's Son. It does not teach that his Sonship originated from his being made of a woman. The original word in this text, translated *made*, might with much more propriety be translated *born*. The text, thus translated, would stand in this manner, "God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law." It is not true that the humanity of Jesus was wholly *made* of a woman. His human spirit was not derived from Mary. She did not impart any portion of her spirit to his body. Spirit is not divisible; and of course it is not a subject of propagation. The body and soul of Jesus were both *born* of Mary. It is presumable that Divinity was united to his body before his birth, that it was

united at the time of his conception; that both natures were brought into the world in union. Before Jesus was born, he was called that holy thing. Though the holy thing might embrace only his humanity; yet it was probably called holy, not only on account of his immaculate conception, but on account of his union with Divinity. It is evident that divine nature was in union with the child Jesus immediately after his birth, because he was called Emmanuel, which signifies, "God with us." The name would not be appropriate if divine nature were not united with the human nature of Jesus. As there is nothing recorded, which affords evidence that such union occurred *after* his birth, it is presumable that it occurred before this event. In view of these suggestions the text under consideration reads naturally, "God sent forth his Son." He sent him forth from heaven. He was "born of a woman" in conjunction with human nature. He was "born under the law;" he was born under the Jewish dispensation, and was subject to the institutions and ordinances of the ceremonial law. In his human nature he was subjected to death. Though he knew no sin himself; yet he suffered death for the sins of others.

"The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." These words Christ spoke, when he was in the flesh. When he made this declaration, did he design to convey the idea that his human nature was in the bosom of the Father, and that his human nature had declared him? Were these the primary ideas that he designed to convey by this declaration? Does the appellation, the only begotten Son, in this text, apply primarily to the humanity of Christ? Christ's Divinity is in more intimate union with the Father than his humanity. When he is said to be in the bosom of the Father, it has of course a primary reference to his Divinity. Christ, in his divine nature has declared the Father much more than he has in his human nature. When

he is said to declare him, it has, of course, a primary reference to his divine nature.

Some communication was made in the Old Testament respecting the Father and the Son. If the relationship, which these names import, actually existed at that time, why was it not more fully and distinctly revealed? For the same reason, undoubtedly, for which the doctrine of the Trinity, and the scheme of redemption were not so fully and distinctly revealed in the Old, as in the New Testament. God revealed himself, and unfolded his gracious designs by degrees. So intimate was the connexion between the doctrine of the Trinity and the plan of salvation, that the unfolding of the one would, in a great measure, unfold the other. As God designed not to make a full display of the method of salvation till after the incarnation of his Son, he of course, withheld a proportionate display of the relationship which subsisted in the divine nature. As the economy of redemption depended on this relationship, it appears proper that they should be revealed proportionably and together.

In the Old Testament the divine nature was revealed by many names. Among others, it was revealed by the names Father and Son. Did not a relationship then subsist between these two, which was a proper ground for applying to them these relative names? Or, were these names applied to them only in view of a relationship, which was afterwards to subsist? In support of the affirmative of the latter question it is argued, "We say, when king David kept his father's sheep. But he was not *king* when he kept them. We say, when king Solomon was born. Yet he was not born *king* nor *Solomon*. But afterward being known by both the office and the name, these are carried back to his birth, when his birth is spoken of. One says, my father was born in such a year. He does not mean that he was born *his father*." From these premises it is inferred that when it is said, "God so loved the world that he sent his only begotten Son;

God sent forth his Son;" these declarations do not import that Christ was son before he was sent; but that "the plain meaning appears to be, God sent his beloved Logos, the darling of his bosom, infinitely dear, as one with himself, who took human nature, and was manifested as the *only begotten Son* of God." This reasoning does not appear to be correct. Because the examples adduced are not parallel with the subject under consideration. The examples take the *present* name, relationship and office of persons, and apply the same to them at a *past* period of their life. But, according to the argument, the subject takes the *future* name of Christ, and applies it to him at the present time. If it be proper to apply the present name of a person to him in a *past* condition of life, it does not follow that it is proper to apply the future name of a person to him in his present state. The premises and the conclusion are not analogous; and of course the argument is not correct; and the inference is not conclusive.

In the divine nature the same relationship always has subsisted and always will subsist. Among creatures new relationships arise; and as creatures come into existence relationships arise between them and their Creator. But there is no change in the divine Being. If there be ground in the divine nature now for calling one of the Trinity Father and another Son, there always was ground for the application of these relative names. If one of the Trinity was manifested to the world as Son of God, there was ground in his nature for this manifestation before he appeared in the world. His coming into the world and assuming human nature did not affect his relation to the others of the Trinity. His humanity commenced its relationship with God, but his Divinity no more commenced a relationship with the Father, than it commenced existence. Whatever his human nature may be called, it does not affect the proper name of his divine nature.

There is a certain relationship subsisting between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The question now is, whether there appears to be ground in the divine nature for calling one of them Son? There is no dispute that one is called Father. He is not so called in relation to creatures; because when their Father is named, it is God without the distinction of individuality. When one of the Trinity is called Father, it is in relation to another of the Trinity. If it be proper to call the first Father in relation to the second, it is proper to call the second Son in relation to the first.

The great love of God toward the human race is argued in the scriptures from his not sparing his own Son; but delivering him up for us all. If God's Son imports no more than the man Christ Jesus, God did not manifest an extraordinary love for the human race in giving him up in sacrifice. If a prince should subject to death one of his subjects for the sake of the preservation of the rest, he would not display an extraordinary love for them. Any prince would do the same. But if, for this purpose he should expose to death his own, and only son, who was bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, he would give decisive evidence of his exceedingly great love for his subjects. If God has exposed one of the Trinity, who was in the most near and endearing relationship to himself, to all the insolence and violence, which an ungrateful world could offer him, it cannot be doubted that he entertained an affectionate regard for his human rebellious subjects. Because the sacrifice of his Son was efficacious and satisfactory, there is the strongest evidence that the Son was of higher nature and dignity than mere humanity.

The sacred scriptures testify that God *sent his Son* into the world. This mode of expression conveys the idea that Christ was his Son, when he sent him; and that the act of sending him, or of attaching human nature to him, did not make him his Son. If

it be said that a man sends his son on business it is understood that the child is really a son at the time he was sent; and not that he is to be made a son by any future act. God's sending his Son into the world, signifies his sending one of the Trinity upon earth among mankind. This act of sending the Son, cannot have reference to his introduction to the duties of his office, because he was in the world before this time. To say he was sent into the world after he was in the world, would not be a correct mode of expression. If the Son whom God sent into the world, was one of the Trinity, there was the same ground for calling him Son before, as there was after he was sent. No new relation has ever been formed between them; and he that was sent from heaven, has, ever since the apostasy, stood in the same relation to the human race. He has been appointed to no new office since that time. He has acted in no office since that time, which would appropriately give him the name Son.

The apostle Paul to the Hebrews, has given information on what ground he received this name. He obtained by inheritance, or *he hath inherited*, (according to the original) the name Son. "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained, or *he hath inherited* a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee; and again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son." The apostle gives us to understand that the name, which was better than that of the angels was Son; and he expressly says he inherited this name. Many of his names were official. He was called Messiah, Jesus, Lord, Christ, Mediator, Redeemer. These names he did not inherit in the same sense. They were given him on account of the offices, which he sustained. The name Son, he inherited. He was entitled to it by the relationship, which subsisted between him and the Father.

Angels and men have received the name Son of God. But they did not inherit it, in the same sense, in which he did. Christ obtained this name in a peculiar and distinguishing sense, in a sense, in which no creature ever obtained it. This is an evidence that he is in nearer relationship to the Father than any created being. If Christ was called Son, only on account of his human nature, then he was not Son in any higher sense than angels and men; and he inherited it in no other manner than they. But the apostle reasons otherwise. He argues Christ's nearer relationship to the Father, and his superior excellence and dignity from this fact, that he *inherited* a more excellent name than the angels; that he inherited the name Son of God.

It is admitted that the humanity of Christ is sometimes called Son of God. The scriptures testify that he raised his Son from the dead. But the man Christ Jesus was not Son of God in a higher sense than Adam. When Christ is called God's own and only Son; his dearly beloved, his first begotten, his only begotten Son, these appellations primarily designate his divine nature. If either of these appellations are applied to his humanity, it is because his humanity is united with him, who is in a peculiar sense the Son of God.

If the sonship of Christ originated from his humanity, then the Holy Spirit was Father of the Son. The angel declared to Joseph, "that which is conceived in her, (i. e. Mary,) is of the Holy Ghost." When Christ addresses his Father, he does not address the Holy Spirit. He addresses another of the Trinity. Why is this, if the Holy Spirit is the Father of the Son. When Christ addresses his Father, he addresses him, who sent him from heaven into the world, and whom he obeys. He addresses him who stands first in order in the work of redemption.

It is natural to inquire *why* two of the Trinity are called Father and Son? It is not supposable that finite minds can fully understand the ground of relationship

in the divine plurality. It appears reasonable that the relationship between the Father and the Son is not literal; that there is not that priority and posteriority of existence, and those claims and obligations, which there are between a human father and son. If there be a striking analogy in several prominent points in the relationship between Christ and the Father, and between a human son and his father, there is sufficient ground for calling Christ the Son of the Father, or the Son of God. Such analogy appears; and there appears to be just ground for applying to them the relative names Father and Son.

The relationship between God and the human nature of Christ is not a sufficient ground for calling him *literally*, Son of God. The origination of his existence, and the origination of the existence of a human son, in the ordinary way, were too different to be a ground for calling him, by this name. Yet there is such a resemblance between the origination of the two, that figuratively the man Christ Jesus, may, with propriety, be called Son of God. If this appellation be applied figuratively to Christ, either in his human, or divine nature, it is also used figuratively, when it is applied to him without the distinction of natures.

In the Old Testament, Christ, in relation to the Father, is called Son. He is called by this name in connexion with the present, the past and future tense. By one prophet God said of Christ, "Thou *art* my Son; he *shall* be to me a Son." By another prophet he said, "I *called* my Son out of Egypt." These passages appear to furnish evidence that the sonship of Christ may be traced as remotely, at least, as the time when these declarations were made. But in the prophetic writings tenses are not always used literally. Revelation was much more obscurely made in the Old, than in the New Testament. There is much greater reason for explaining the Old Testament by the New, than there is for explaining the New Testament by the Old. It is much more reasonable to explain pro-

phecy by its event, than to explain an event by its prophecy. The reality affords more correct and definite ideas than the representation. The Sun of Righteousness sheds more copious light than all the shadows, which had dimly prefigured him. The Old Testament, like the lesser light in the firmament, *reflects* light from its obscure representations. But the New Testament, like the sun in the heavens, sheds its own native splendor.

Christ's being begotten, first begotten, only begotten, import his introduction into the world; his introduction into office; his reception of all authority, and his resurrection from the dead. These acts did not bring him into a new relationship with the Father. They did not *make* him Son. They declared, or manifested that he *was* the Son of God.*

* If there be distinctions in the divine nature, it is not incredible that names should be given them to designate their relationship with each other. Whatever that relationship is, it cannot be expected that any name, or names, can give us a full conception of it. There is nothing, which falls under our notice, which can give an adequate representation of those distinctions, which constitute the divine plurality. But when God would reveal himself to us, he uses various similitudes, so that he may, in some measure, bring himself down to our conception. When he would express the near relationship between himself, the Creator, and ourselves his creatures, he calls himself Father, and us his children. When he would acquaint us with his knowledge of the affairs of this world, he represents himself, as if he possessed organs of sense. This is figurative language, and it conveys the ideas, which were designed. If he would reveal to us the distinctions and relationships, which exist in his nature, he must, undoubtedly, use words in a figurative sense; because these are subjects, different from all those, with which we are acquainted. When he reveals himself by the relative terms, Father and Son, these distinctive appellations must be understood in a sense not inconsistent with the divine perfections. Whatever is predicated of the Son of God, as it respects his nature, which implies literal sonship, literal generation, derivation, emanation, or procession, appears to be directly against his independence and his eternal, self-existence. Or, in other words, it appears to be directly against his divinity. But if it be admitted that the distinctive terms, Father and Son, are to be understood in a figurative sense, this difficulty ceases to exist.

If the phrases, Son of God, first begotten, only begotten, first born, are understood figuratively, they may be consistently applied to Christ, in his divine nature, unless certain texts of scripture, render this application inadmissible. So far from this, the scriptures apply to him the term Son, before he took upon him the form of a servant. The apostle, in his epistle to the Hebrews, speaking of the Son, says, "By whom also he made the worlds." John, in his Gospel, attributes the creation of the world to the Logos. There is no doubt that the Son and Logos are the same; and it appears that both are names given to his divine nature. When it is considered that several names are given to God without a view of the distinctions in his nature, it is not incredible that more names than one should be given to the Son of God. It is not doubted that he derived names from his offices, from his works, and from his union with human nature. But it appears that, independently of these, he *inherited by right*, one name, and that was Son.

DIVINE NAMES GIVEN TO CHRIST.

NAMES, in the sacred scriptures, are frequently significant of the nature or qualities of the thing or being named. When language was in its infancy, names were given to different classes of beings, whose natural signification would distinguish one class from another. In giving names to individuals of a species, words were used, which designated some characteristic quality; or some remarkable circumstance attending them. The word Adam, which was used for a name of the first man, signifies ruddy, earth, man. His name, therefore, denoted the substance and one of its qualities, of which his body was formed. The name, Eve, given to the first woman signifies "the manifester, because she was, or was to be the mother of all that live." This denotes her relative situation to the human family. The word Moses signifies to draw out. This name was given to a child, which was hidden among the flags on the river's brink; and this name was given him because he was drawn out of the water; and this was the most prominent circumstance of his early life. The name, angel, is given to that elevated order of spirits, which stand around God's throne, and receive messages from him to this world, because the original word, both in Hebrew and in Greek signifies messenger, or one sent. The name characterizes their office. Instances of significant names in the sacred scriptures are too numerous to

be quoted. Those already cited are sufficient for the present purpose.

"The Hebrew names of God, as Jerome (the best Hebrecian of the fathers) observes are ten; three come from being; three from power; three from governing; one from excellence." He is called the holy One, which name denotes his moral excellence. As the names of things, of persons, and of God in the sacred scriptures are significant, it is not improbable that the names of his Son are significant; that they are expressive of his nature and attributes.

"What is his Son's name, if thou canst tell?" His name is God. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was *God.*" When Thomas saw Christ after his resurrection, and had full evidence that it was he, who had been crucified, he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God." In the original it is expressed with peculiar emphasis, and conveys the clearest idea of his belief of his divinity. (ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου.) Christ, instead of upbraiding him for his faith, and for ascribing to him this divine title, manifested his approbation. "Of whom, as concerning the flesh *Christ* came, who is over all, *God* blessed forever." All the forced constructions of this text have not destroyed its natural and most obvious import. The Father himself bears testimony to the same truth. "Unto the Son he saith, thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." The truth of this witness cannot safely be disputed. God said to Moses, "behold I send an *Angel* before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place, which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for *he will not pardon* your transgressions; for *my name* is in him." This Angel was Christ; and God's name was in him. He is therefore called with propriety by the name, God.

Those, who deny the Divinity of Christ, are necessitated to admit that he is called by this divine name; but they endeavor to evade the force of it by say-

ing, that he is not called God to signify his divinity; but only to express his high offices, and his delegated authority. This is mere assertion; and of course it requires only contradiction. To say that the name God, when applied to the Father, signifies divine nature, but when applied to the Son signifies something different, is asserting the very thing to be proved. There is as much evidence that Christ is divine, from the application of the name God to him, as there is that the Father is divine from the application of the same name to himself. If a certain name, attribute, or work will not prove Christ's divinity, the same name, attribute and work will not prove the Father's divinity. It ought to be admitted that what will prove the divine nature of the latter will also prove the divine nature of the former.

Christ is called in the sacred scriptures the mighty God. He is also called the Almighty. The prophet Isaiah speaking of the Child, which would be born of a virgin, says, "his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the *Mighty God.*" This latter title is given to the one supreme God of Israel. If this name has any evidence in proof of *his* divine nature, it has equal evidence in proof of the divine nature of Christ. In the Apocalypse it is written, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the *Almighty.* It has been objected that this text does not apply to the Son, but to the Father. But the text, viewed in connexion with what precedes and what follows it, was evidently spoken by Christ, and applied to himself.

Another name given to Christ is *everlasting Father.* When the word Father is applied to Christ it is not to be considered of the same import as it is when applied to *him*, whom Christ calls his Father, and we call our Father. He does not sustain a paternal relation to himself, nor to the human family. The word father in the sacred scriptures has different significations, and it is used in various senses. It signifies one

who has children; it signifies the author or inventor of a thing; an instructor; a ruler, a desire. In all these senses Christ may be called a Father, either figuratively or literally. He is the *Author* of salvation. He is an *Instructor.* He taught the world a system of religion. He is a *Ruler.* He is frequently styled a *King.* He has a kingdom. He is a *Desire.* He is called the desire of nations. He is much to be desired; for he is much needed. The original words, translated everlasting Father, might more naturally be rendered, Father of eternity (אבי עד.) This naturally expresses his eternal existence.

Christ is called King of glory, Lord of glory, and God of glory. No terms could be selected, which could express in a higher degree the glory of Christ. The glory of the Father cannot be represented by language in a brighter light.

Christ is styled King of kings and Lord of lords. The same titles are applied by the apostle to God the Father. "Who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords." These names imply that the Son hath dominion over the highest created powers, and that his authority is equal to that of the Father. As his titles are the same, there is no evidence from this source that his authority is inferior.

Another name given to Christ, is *true God.* "We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the *true God* and eternal life." At the time John wrote his epistles there was a sect which denied the divinity of the Savior, and maintained that he was merely a man. Another sect denied his humanity. In view of these heresies it appears that he designed to establish two points, that Jesus had come in the flesh, and that he was truly divine. With reference to those who denied the humanity of Christ, he said, "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit, that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God. It appears impos-

sible that language could be used, which would be more decidedly against the two prevailing heresies of his day than this. What language could more clearly convey the idea of the real Deity of the Son than this declaration of John, "this is the true God?" Its connexion is so intimate with what is said of the Son, that attempts to evade its force are vain. Besides the additional appellation, "eternal life," is peculiar to the Son.

God, to distinguish himself from all the gods of the heathen, styled himself Jehovah. This name denotes independent existence. The Jews had this name in such superstitious veneration that they would not pronounce it in private or public worship; nor would they pronounce it when reading the scriptures. The observations of a certain Jewish Rabbi upon the word Jehovah are pertinent and forcible. Treating on the names or attributes, which the prophets ascribe to God, he observes, "All the names of the most High, which are found in the books (i. e. of the bible) are derived from his actions; and that, which has no derivation in it is only one, i. e. the Tetragrammaton, which is appropriated to the most High only; therefore it is called a declared name, which signifieth the very essence of the most High with clear demonstration, in which there is no equal or partner with him. But the rest of his names, i. e. Judge, Mighty, Righteous, Merciful, God, &c. are all names, which declare the effects and derivation, &c. But the Tetragrammaton name is unknown as yet as to its certain derivation; and therefore it is attributed to him only." But even this name, which is significant of the divine essence, is applied to Christ. The prophet Jeremiah, in view of the advent of Christ, observes, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch; and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called

Jehovah our righteousness." This prophecy is believed generally to be applied to Christ. As this name is expressive of divine nature, it follows that Christ possesses divine nature, or the name was wrongly applied. There are many other passages in which Christ is implicitly called Jehovah. Was it not Christ, who held intercourse with the Israelites in their departure from Egypt, and in the wilderness? Did he not make himself known to them by the name Jehovah; and did he not style himself, I am?

To this it has been objected that the name Jehovah has been given to places and altars. Abraham called the place where he was about to offer his son Isaac Jehovah-jireh, the Lord will see or provide. After Moses had prevailed in battle against Amalek, by the special interposition of divine Providence, he erected an altar unto the Lord, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi, the Lord, my banner. After Gideon had seen an angel and had holden converse with the Lord, he built an altar unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah-shalom, the Lord send peace. From the application of this divine name to inanimate things, it is inferred by some that the application of it to Christ does not imply his divinity; and that this name might appropriately be given him, if he were but a mere man. It ought to be considered that when the name Jehovah was given to those places, it was used with some qualifying addition; it was used not to express the nature of the place or thing, but to express some circumstance which was signalized by divine presence or agency. As the cases are not parallel, the objection loses its force.

Another significant name given to Christ is Immanuel. "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel." This prophecy was fulfilled. A virgin brought forth a Son, and his name was Immanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. The apostle Paul to the Corinthians saith, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

Christ saith, "the Father is in me." No language could more clearly prove that divinity was united to the man, Christ Jesus. But it is objected that this divine name is applied to Christ in no other sense than divine names were formerly applied to places and things. It has been said that when divine names were given to places and things they did not, neither were they designed to, express their nature or qualities; but they expressed the manifestation of divine presence, or some divine interposition. When Jacob had seen the vision of the ladder and angels ascending and descending, he was afraid and said, "surely the Lord is in this place." From this circumstance he called the name of the place *Bethel*, which signifies house of God. After Jacob had wrestled with a man and prevailed and obtained his blessing, he called the name of the place Peniel; and he gives this reason, "I have seen God face to face." Peniel signifies face of God. These distinguished places were not divine, *because* they had received names, made up in part of the divine name; neither did they receive these names *because* they were divine. But these names were given them because God was there. The name Immanuel was not given to the child of Mary, because that child was divine, (for it was not) but because God was there; because the divine Son was in the child. Allowing the objection to have all its force, it serves to prove that divinity was united with the humanity of Jesus Christ.

The name, Lord God of hosts, is applied to Christ. The prophet, adverting to the wrestling of Jacob with the angel, said, "By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the Angel and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto him; he found him in Bethel and there he spake with us. Even the Lord God of hosts; the Lord is his memorial." The original words translated Lord God signify Jehovah God. God declared to Moses, "this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." Jacob

called the Angel with whom he wrestled God. This Angel was undoubtedly Christ. Consequently his name is Lord God; or more properly Jehovah God.

Those, who deny the divinity of Christ contend that divine names have been frequently given to men. The Lord said unto Moses, see, I have made thee a god unto Pharaoh. When God gave laws to Israel he commanded him saying, "Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people." The apostle Paul acknowledges that there be that are called gods, for there be lords many and gods many. It is true *some* divine names have been given to men and things. But *all* divine names have not been given to them. The unqualified name Jehovah was never given to any man or place. No created being is called in the scriptures mighty God, Lord God, true God, great God, God over all blessed forever more, Almighty, Lord of glory, King of kings, Lord of lords, Alpha and Omega, Lord God of hosts. But these names, without any qualification, without any intimation that they are to be understood in a reduced sense, are given to Christ. God, by his apostle saith he has given him a name, which is *above* every name. If no other divine names were given to Christ but those, which have been given to men, there would be some ground for denying that his names prove his divinity. But other and higher titles are given to him. The same exalted names, which were given to the one God of Israel are given to him. If these names do any thing toward proving the divinity of Israel's God, they do the same toward proving the divinity of Christ. If the divine names have no meaning, they are useless. If they have an unappropriate meaning, they are worse than useless; they lead to error.

"What is his name and what is his Son's name?" The manner of this question implies that it is equally difficult to give a fully characteristic name to one, as to the other. The names of the Father and the Son are significant and characteristic; but they do not con-

vey to our finite minds adequate ideas of the divine nature, nor of the mode of divine subsistence. God has not left himself without witness, nor his Son without witness that he is God. When the magicians wrought, or feigned to work miracles in imitation of those, which God wrought by the hand of Moses, God was pleased to give a visible superiority to his own miracles, that it might appear that the power was of God. So when God suffered his creatures to be called by divine titles, to prevent misapprehension of the nature and dignity of his Son, he gave him decidedly superior titles; he gave him a name, which is *above* every name.*

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. John 1: 1. It appears that one design of John in writing his Gospel was to confute the heresies, which had sprung up in the churches. The most prominent of which were those of the Docetæ, and the Ebionites. The former believed the divinity of Christ, but denied his humanity. They maintained that he had a body only in *appearance;* that he did not actually suffer and die; that he only *seemed* to do those things, which were related of him. The latter admitted the history of Jesus was founded on reality; but they denied his divinity. "For the most part looked on Jesus Christ as a mere man, born of Mary and her husband, though a man of a most excellent character." "The opinions of the Docetæ, on the one hand, and of the Corinthians on the other," (who were nearly coincident with the Ebionites) concerning the person and offices of Christ, make it probable that the apostles taught, and that the first Christians believed Christ to be both God and man. For if the Docetæ had not been taught the divinity of Christ, they had no temptation to deny his humanity. And if the Corinthians had not been taught the humanity of Christ, they would have been under no necessity of denying his divinity." (See Mosheim's Eccles. hist. Milner's Chh. hist. Macknight's pref. to the 1st Epis. of John.) In opposition to these heresies St. John positively declared that the Word was God; and that the Word was made flesh.

By some it is denied that John used the word Logos to signify Christ; but admit, that if the Logos were Christ, it would prove his divinity. In the revelation of St. John he is called the Word of God. There is a peculiar significancy in calling him the Word, or the Word of God. For as words are the medium of conveying thought, so Christ was the medium of conveying the will of God to man. When the Evangelist asserts that the Word was made flesh, it appears to be proved as clearly as language can prove it, that the Word was Christ. When he asserts that this Word was God, it appears equally clear that Christ is truly divine. If the Evangelist had designed to express his divinity in an inferior sense, he would undoubtedly have employed some qualifying term. But as he did not, we are not authorized to make the addition. The absence of the article before θεος in this place does not affect its meaning.

After St. John had represented the Word existing in the beginning; existing with God; and asserted that it was God, he adds, "The Word was made εγενετο or became flesh. By this assertion he did not mean that the nature of the Word was changed into the nature of flesh. He undoubtedly meant that the Word appeared in the *likeness* of flesh. "God sending his own Son in the *likeness* of sinful flesh —God sent forth his own Son, *made of a woman.* Who being in the form of God,—took upon him the form of a *servant,* and was made in the *likeness of men.*" The phraseology of John, and also of the apostle, in the quotations just made, naturally conveys the idea that the Word existed separate from, and before the flesh.

The translation, "The Word *was* flesh" (see the Improved Version of the New Testament) purporting that it was a mere man, savors more of a preconceived opinion, than of a correct knowledge of the Greek. Previous to this declaration, the Evangelist had used the verb ην nine times and uniformly to express simple, past existence. He had used the verb εγενετο and its inflexions six times to convey the idea of something *made* or *done*. If he had designed to convey no other idea than, the Word *was* flesh, he would undoubtedly have used the verb ην, as he had done, to express past existence. On the other hand, if he designed, by connecting the terms, the Word and flesh by a copula, to convey an idea that something was *made* or *done*, he undoubtedly would have used the same verb, which he had used in that signification. If, after having used this verb uniformly in one sense, he should, without giving the least notice, use it in a different sense, he would mislead, rather than rightly direct his readers. It appears therefore that the translation in our Bible is correct. The Word was *made* flesh.

The verb εγενετο in the New Testament is sometimes translated *was*. But it is presumable that it is not synonymous with ην, which precisely corresponds with our English verb, was. In John 1:6, εγενετο is translated was. "There was a man sent from God." It would be a literal translation, and agreeable to the translation of the verb in many other places in the New Testament, to render the passage thus, it came to pass a man was sent from God. It could not be the design of the Evangelist in using the verb εγενετο to declare the *existence* of the man, who was sent from God. The declaration that he was sent, implied his existence; εγενετο is translated was, in Luke 24:19, "Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which *was* a prophet." It is worthy of remark, that this was the language of a disciple after the crucifixion; that he was disappointed in his expectations; that, although he had heard of the resurrection of Jesus, he did not understand it. In this state of disappointment and grief; not knowing with whom he was travelling; not knowing to what disgrace and danger he might be exposed, if he attributed divinity to his crucified Master, he diffidently and cautiously said, ὁς εγενετο ανηρ προφητης. Literally translated it is, who was made a man prophet.

"The Word was made flesh." The next clause illustrates this. "And dwelt (εσκηνωσεν) among us." According to the original word the Logos dwelt as in a tent among us; i. e. he occupied human nature, the man Christ Jesus.

My Lord and my God. John 20:28. These words of Thomas, addressed to Christ, appear not to be an ellipsis, as some have maintained, but an exclamation; an exclamation of such a kind that it amounts to a confession that Christ was his Lord and God. It is in vain to object that Κυριος and Θεος, are in the nominative case. For the nominative is frequently used for the vocative. When Christ on the cross addressed the Father, he addressed him in the nominative case, ὁ Θεος μου, ὁ Θεος μου, as it is recorded by St. Mark. The LXX use the nominative for the vocative. The great advantage of considering the words of Thomas an ellipsis is, that people may complete the sentence so as to favor their own system.

Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Rom. 9:5. If the received text be genuine; if the construction and pointing of this passage be correct, it offers its aid to prove the doctrine of Christ's divinity. He descended from the fathers, *according to the flesh;* he "was made, (or born) of the seed of David, *according to the flesh.*" This mode of expression intimates that he had another nature, according to which he did not descend from the fathers, or from the seed of David. Who in this passage, relates to Christ; and he is over, or above, all. God is in apposition with Christ. The term blessed, which is applied to the Father, is applied to him.

But this text has suffered the same fate with many others, which teach the same doctrine. It is maintained that many copies want θεος. "Some, therefore, may have inferred, that this text cannot fairly be adduced in support of the Trinitarian scheme; and yet the received reading is confirmed by all the manuscripts, which have been hitherto collated; by all the ancient versions; and by all the fathers, except Cyprian, in the *printed* copies, and also Hilary and Leo, who, according to Griesbach, have each of them *once* referred to this text without noticing θεος. Whence the notion arose that θεος is wanting in many MSS. I am not able to discover. There is scarcely a verse in the New Testament, in which ancient authorities more nearly agree." (Middleton on the Greek Ar-

ticle.) The passage under consideration has been transposed and pointed in such a manner that it imports a doxology to the Father. But this transposition offends against the idiom of the Greek language; against the usage of the LXX. and of the writers of the New Testament. (See Middleton in loco.)

Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. By some it is supposed that the Psalm, from which the apostle quoted this passage, was composed in celebration of Solomon's marriage with Pharaoh's daughter. This Psalm is entitled, "A song of loves." It is not probable that David would have composed a song upon his son's love for strange women; women, with whom he was forbidden to have connexion. If he had made this the subject of his song, he could hardly have said, "My heart is inditing a *good* matter." In this view of his son, he would not probably have addressed him by the title, "O God." Besides, Solomon's kingdom lasted but forty years. It could not, therefore, be said to be "for ever and ever." It was permanent but partially in the line of his posterity; for ten tribes revolted from his son, and did not return. In view of his strange loves, which were prohibited by divine authority, the Psalmist would not probably have said, "thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity."

The Psalm was undoubtedly applied to the Messiah; for it appears to be applicable only to him. The quotation, which the apostle makes from it, he applies to the Son. In the beginning of his Epistle to the Hebrews, he contrasts the Son with the angels; and to give him the preference, to give him an infinite superiority, he applies to him a part of the 45th Psalm. "Unto the *Son* he saith, thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." There is no danger in applying this declaration as the apostle applied it, notwithstanding the ingenious criticisms of the learned.

Some critics have given to the passage under consideration a translation, essentially different from our English version. "God is thy throne for ever and ever. The everlasting God is thy throne." But neither the scope of the apostle's discourse, nor the phraseology, which he used, favors this translation. He was setting forth the superior excellence and dignity of the Son. After representing angels as servants, it was necessary, to make the contrast, to represent the Son having authority. But if he designed to attribute to him only a limited or delegated authority; that God, not himself, supported his throne, where would be the superiority of Christ above them; for they have a limited, a delegated authority? When it is brought into one view, that the Son hath inherited a more excellent name than they; that the angels of God are commanded to worship him; that in the beginning he laid the foundation of the earth, and that the heavens are the works of his hands; that he is the same, and that his years shall not fail, it would be an unhappy descent in the description to assign him a throne, which he could not support himself; a throne, which he did not inherit, which he did not occupy by right.

Ὁ θεος being in the nominative case does not justify the improved version of the text. For the LXX often use the nominative for the vocative; and it was from them the apostle made the quotation. The Atticks used the same manner of writing. If throne was the predicate of the verb, it would, according to the rules of Greek criticism, want the article. But as it has the article prefixed, there is evidence that it is the subject of the verb; and that the common English Version is correct. The application of this text to Solomon; the unnatural transposition of its parts; and the unfounded criticisms, which have been made upon it, give evidence that the cause is desperate, which requires such means for its support.

And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life; 1 John 5:20. The most natural reference of the pronoun *this*, is to Jesus Christ in the preceding sentence. It is a general rule that the demonstrative pronoun refers to the nearest antecedent. But there is sometimes a departure from this rule when a more remote antecedent is the principal subject; and a reference to it is so visible in the sense that it occasions no ambiguity. But this exception does not apply to the text under consideration. The Son of God is the leading and most prominent subject. Neither the sense, nor the nature of the subject would warrant a departure from the general rule in this instance, unless it be first assumed that Jesus Christ is not divine, the very point to be proved.

The terms used in the text, viewed in connexion with other parts of the Epistle, favor the opinion that they are applied to the Son of God. There is no small degree of evidence that the phrase, *him that is true*, signifies Christ. At the time John wrote, there were false teachers. They represented Christ very differently from what he really was. These he calls antichrist; and gives a caution to try their spirit. After describing the errors which then prevailed, and shewing how they might be detected, he observed at the close of his first Epistle, that Jesus Christ had come; that he had given them an understanding (διανοια) i. e. knowledge, or the means of knowing him that is true; of distinguishing the *true* Christ from false ones; that by signs and wonders, by doctrine and life, he gave such evidence that he was the *true* Messiah that they needed not to be deceived. "We are *in him* that is true." This manner of expression is applied elsewhere to Christ. "If any man be *in Christ*, he is a new creature." "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." The figure of the vine and the branches implies that the members of Christ are *in him*. Besides, Jesus applies to himself the terms true and truth. The additional clause, "in his Son Jesus Christ," appears to be explanatory of the two preceding, viz. "in him that is true."

"This is the true God and eternal life." Life and eternal life are titles often given to Christ. In the beginning of the Epistle John calls him "the Word of life, the Life, eternal Life." When it is considered that he applies this title to him in the beginning of his letter, it is presumable, at least, that at the close, he applies the same title to the same personage. Of Christ it is said, "In him was *life*, and the *Life* was the light of men. I am the resurrection and the *Life*. God hath given to us eternal *Life;* and this *Life* is in his Son." These evidences appear to be conclusive that the title, true God in the text, is applied to the Son.

Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel; Isaiah 7:14. Perhaps this prophecy in its primary application was fulfilled soon after its delivery by a person, born in an extraordinary manner; who delivered Judah from his threatening enemies; and, for the remarkable interposition of divine Providence attending him, was called Immanuel. If such an application of the text be correct, it is admitted that the name is appropriate; that God was with his people by qualifying him for their deliverance. But this concession does not militate against the application of this prophecy in a secondary and higher sense. The successor of Moses was called Joshua; (the same in the original as Jesus;) and the name was appropriate. But who doubts that the name Jesus, when given to the Son of God, is of a higher and more important meaning?

There is evidence that the prophecy, under consideration, was ultimately applied to Christ, because St. Matthew, in giving the history of his nativity applies it to him. "Now all this was done," (says the Evangelist) "that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us." Not a little exertion has been used to shew that this part of St. Matthew's account of Christ is spurious. But as no *proof* has been produced to this effect, it is not presumptuous to offer it in support of the doctrine of Christ's divinity. It is a matter of surprise that texts to this effect should, more than any others, be charged with spuriousness, with incorrect readings and incorrect versions. Should the charge be supported against St. Matthew, a similar difficulty will be found in St. Luke's gospel. He states the miraculous conception of Mary by the Holy Spirit. Though he does not say that this event is a fulfilment of the prophet's prediction; yet, according to his account of the matter, it was no less a fulfilment, than if he had declared it to be so. If God was with his people, when he sent them deliverers, who rescued them from temporal evils, more specially was he with them when he united himself in a peculiar manner with human nature, and delivered them by his own hand from spiritual enemies, from the bondage of sin.

Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; Titus 2:13. *Through the righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ;* 2 Peter 1:1. There are several other passages in the Epistles, in which the name God and Jesus Christ have a similar connexion. If the second noun (Savior) were not in apposition with the first (God) or an attributive of the same article, it would have an article before itself. But as it has not, it is inferred that it is a predicate of the article, which stands before

God; and of course the title, Great God, is given in this text to Jesus Christ. The rules of Greek criticism are so well established that this conclusion is drawn with confidence. *See Middleton on the Greek Article.* In the second text quoted, there appears to be additional evidence that God and the Savior Jesus Christ are the same. Peter directs his salutation to those, who had obtained like precious faith with themselves through the righteousness of God. Righteousness in this sense and application is repeatedly attributed to Christ; but it is presumed that it is not so applied to the Father exclusively. It is through the righteousness, i. e. the obedience and sufferings of Christ that people receive any Christian grace.

DIVINE ATTRIBUTES ASCRIBED TO CHRIST.

WHO being....the express image of his person. Heb. 1:3. This is predicted of the Son, Jesus Christ, in relation to God the Father. The original is somewhat more expressive. It signifies that he is the character of his (i. e. God's) substance.

All that is known of the nature of a thing is by its qualities. One class of beings is distinguished from another by its different properties. Human nature is known by its distinguishing qualities. Divine nature is known in the same manner. What has human qualities is human nature; and what has divine qualities is divine nature. If it can be shewn that Jesus Christ possesses divine qualities, it consequently follows that he possesses divine nature.

Although Christ possessed human nature; yet there is evidence from the inspired writings that he possessed a nature, which distinguished him from a mere man. Paul, in his salutation to the Galatians, begins thus: "Paul, an apostle, not of *men*, neither by *man*, but by *Jesus Christ*." He inquires, "Do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased *men*, I should not be the servant of *Christ*. But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is not after man; for I neither received it of *man*, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of *Jesus Christ*." The apostle makes a plain distinction between Christ and a man or men. He is therefore understood ascribing to him a nature, which they had not.

The sacred scriptures ascribe eternity to the Lord Jesus. After the apostasy God held intercourse with man, through the medium of his Son. The voice of the Lord God, whom Adam heard walking in the garden, was the Son. It was the Son, who made the covenant with Abraham. It was the Son, who appeared unto Jacob; changed his name, and blessed him. It was the Son, who led Israel out of Egypt; conducted them through the Red Sea; guided and supported them in the wilderness; and led them to the land of promise. All the divine appearances and communications, which are mentioned in the Old Testament, were made by the Son of God. If these exhibitions of himself do not prove his eternity, they prove that he had existence before he was conceived by his mother Mary. It proves that he was more than mere humanity.

Christ saith of himself, "*before Abraham was I am.*" He prayed to the Father, saying, "Glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory which I had with thee, *before the world was.*" Solomon, personifying Wisdom, which is generally understood to be Christ, says, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from *everlasting*, *from the beginning*, or ever the earth was. Then I was by him, as one brought up with him." In these texts is conveyed the idea not only of his pre-existence, but also of his eternal existence. His being by him, as one brought up with him, easily conveys the idea of two, who had *always* lived together; and upon equal terms. When Christ appeared unto John in Patmos, he styled himself, "Alpha and Omega, *the beginning* and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the first and the last." This title was given to God by his prophet; and if it is an evidence of his eternal existence, it affords the same evidence of the eternal existence of the Son Jesus Christ. The prophet, in view of the birth of Christ, makes this address to the place of his nativity. "Thou

Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been *from of old, from everlasting.*" This text is clearly applied to Christ. It mentions his coming forth, which would be at his birth. It mentions also his goings forth, which had been of old, from everlasting. This reduplication of time, according to the nature of the Hebrew language, clearly and forcibly conveys the idea of his eternity. Christ is the express image, or *character* of the divine nature, or substance. His nature is, of course, divine, and his attributes are divine. It is absurd to suppose that the *character* of divinity should be ascribed to Christ, and he be not divine; or that he should possess some divine attributes, and not others. If he be the *character* of divine existence, he is of course eternal.

The title Jehovah, is repeatedly given to Christ. This name signifies self-existence. What is self-existent had no cause nor origin of its existence; and of course must always have existed. If the name Jehovah is rightly applied to Christ, it implies his eternal existence.

The sacred scriptures ascribe immutability to Christ. This is a divine attribute. Whatever has been created is subject to change by the same power, which created it. But he, that is not subject to change, exists without a cause, and of course is divine. The apostle Paul to the Hebrews is clear and decisive on this point. "Thou Lord in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art *the same, and thy years shall not fail.*" The apostle made this address to Christ; and it as decisively proves his divinity, as the same description proves the divinity of the one

true God, when applied to him by the Psalmist. Paul to the Hebrews says, "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." This mode of speaking, expresses duration past, the present time, and duration to come. As he is the *same*, in the past, present, and future time, he *changeth not.*

Christ has been manifested to the world in various manners. To Jacob he appeared in the form of a man. To Moses he appeared in, or in the likeness of, a burning bush. To the Israelites he appeared in, or in the form of, a pillar of cloud, and a pillar of fire. After his incarnation he appeared in human form, in the form of a servant. Since his resurrection he is united to a spiritual body; and is seated on the right hand of divine Majesty. His appearances were different at different times; and his state of humiliation appeared very different from his state of exaltation. But these appearances made no alteration in his nature. He was no less God in the man Christ Jesus, than he was on the right hand of God the Father. His power was not less when he was in the hands of men, and was condemned, or when his body was under the dominion of death, than it was when he created the world. All the adventitious circumstances, which attended him while he was upon earth, produced no change in his nature or attributes.

The scriptures attribute omnipresence to Christ. The Lord Jesus, when he was upon earth, said, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which *is* in heaven." This implies that he was in heaven at the same time he was upon earth. After Christ was received up into heaven, his apostles "went forth and preached every where, the *Lord working with them.*" At this time he sat on the right hand of God. But he was *present* with them, otherwise he could not have *wrought* with them. "Where two or three are met together in my name, (said Christ) there am I in the midst of them." Jesus said unto his disciples,

"Lo, I am *with* you alway, even unto the end of the world." These are individual instances of Christ's presence on earth, while he is in heaven. If these instances do not prove his universal presence, it proves his presence to a great extent. If his presence is extended to a great proportion of his creatures, there is no reason why it should not be extended to all. By him all things were created, and by him all things consist, i. e. are supported. His presence must have been as extensive as his works; and it must now be as extensive as that influence of his, which upholds all things. It is true, all this only proves his presence to be as extensive as the works of creation. The scriptures cannot prove the presence of God the Father to be more extensive. It is not important to prove that divine presence is where nothing feels its influence, nor beholds its glory.

There is abundant evidence from scripture that Christ is omniscient. The apostle Paul says he is *before* all things. Whether he be before all things in respect to duration or dignity, or in respect to both, he undoubtedly has a capacity for this extent of knowledge. As he made all things, he perfectly knows their natures, and the effects, which would arise from any particular combination of things. As he is omnipresent he knows all events, which take place. Nothing is concealed from his view. The word of inspiration confirms this sentiment. His disciples said unto him, "Now we are sure that *thou knowest all things*, and needest not that any man should ask thee." When Peter was interrogated concerning his love toward his divine Master, he replied, "Lord, *thou knowest all things.*" Jesus did not commit himself unto them; because he knew *all men;* and needed not that any should testify of man; for he *knew what was in man.* Jesus knew from the beginning, who they were, that believed not. When prayer was made to the Lord Jesus for direction in filling a place among the apostles, which had been vacated by Judas, he was addressed

thus: "Lord, which *knowest* the hearts of *all men*, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." "The *Word* of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a *discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.* Neither is there any creature, that is not manifest in his sight." Christ, sending word by his servant John, unto the church in Thyatira, says, "all the churches shall know that I am he, *which searcheth the reins and hearts.*" To these may be added another testimony "In whom (i. e. Christ) are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." The sacred scriptures do not ascribe a greater extent of knowledge to God the Father. The office of Mediator between God and man, which Christ sustains, renders it necessary that his knowledge should be adequate to the work. If he was not perfectly acquainted with his Father's will, he would not be capacitated to treat, in his stead, with the human race. If he was not perfectly acquainted with the thoughts, desires, and conditions of the human race, he would not be capacitated to mediate between them and their offended Sovereign. He needs to be perfectly acquainted with both parties, in order to fill the Mediator's office. In addition to this, he has a knowledge of all the works of his hand; and of course he possesses the highest degree of knowledge which can be conceived.

But there are texts of scripture which appear to limit his knowledge; and these texts have been eagerly used for the purpose of robbing Christ of his divine nature. Christ saith, "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath *taught* me, I speak these things." From this it is inferred that he derives his knowledge from the instruction of his heavenly Father. In this discourse with the Jews, Jesus taught them his union with the Father, and his subordination to him. He taught them that he was not alone; that his Father

was with him, and that he acted in perfect coincidence with his will. In the same manner that he was from God, so was his knowledge from God, or he was taught of God. The scriptures represent perfect order, subordination and agreement subsisting in the Trinity, in the work of redemption. If it is the place of the Son to do his Father's will, it is proper to say the Father teaches, or communicates to him his will. This appears to be a correct method in official transactions, although the Son knew all his Father's purposes. It is true Christ knoweth nothing of himself, and he doeth nothing *of* himself. He is in concert with the Father; and the Father is with him in all his operations. The order of offices justifies the mode of expression, which gives priority to one, and posteriority to the other.

Christ speaking of the day of judgment says, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels, which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." From this text has been inferred the limited knowledge of the Son. It has been suggested that so much of this text as relates to the Son was an interpolation by the Arians. But it is not necessary to make this resort in order to explain the passage consistently with the omniscience of the Son. There are various passages, in which Christ expresses his inferiority to the Father; and there are various other passages, in which he expresses his equality with the Father. It is impossible to account for this difference of representations of himself without admitting the union of two natures, the human and divine. He might speak of his humanity in a limited degree. He might also speak of his divinity in an unlimited degree; and in both instances adhere to the truth. In his capacity as Son of man he might not know the time of the day of judgment; but as Son of God he might have a perfect knowledge of it. It is reasonable to suppose that he, who is to raise the dead and pass sentence upon them, should foreknow the day of these

important events. It can be said with truth that man is mortal. It can be said with equal truth that he is immortal. Our Lord said at a certain time, "Now *I am no more in the world.*" Again he said, "Ye have the poor always with you, but me ye have not *always.*" In another place he says, "Lo I am with you *always.*" The fact was, his bodily presence was soon to be removed from them; but his spiritual presence was to be continued. Of course, what he denied respecting his humanity he might with propriety and sincerity assert respecting his divinity. If he could make this distinction in one point of view, there is no reason why he might not make the same distinction in another point of view. This mode of speaking did not probably convey distinct ideas to the minds of his disciples. He often taught them in obscure figures. He did not design to make a full revelation of himself till after his resurrection. A full disclosure of himself while he was upon earth would have had a tendency to frustrate the object of his coming into the world. "We speak the wisdom of God in a *mystery*, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, *they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.*"

Goodness or holiness is attributed, in an eminent degree to Christ, in the sacred scriptures. In his incarnate state he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." The object of his coming into the world and the works, which he performed while he was upon earth, indicated, in the highest degree, the holiness of his nature. If it was an act of divine goodness to create the world; form man upright and place him in paradise, it was an act of equal goodness to make a propitiation for sin; to pay a ransom for sinners; and to prepare mansions for them in Paradise above. Those particular acts of goodness, which characterize the nature of God, are also ascribed to

Christ. Is God called merciful? Of the Son it is said, "Looking for the *mercy* of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." Is God called gracious? Of Christ it is said, "If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is *gracious*." Is God called long-suffering? The apostle Paul says, "I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all *long-suffering*." Is righteousness ascribed to God? Christ is called the righteous Judge; the Lord our righteousness. It is by his righteousness that sinners are justified. St. John heard the angel say, "Thou art righteous O Lord."

When the rich young man addressed Christ by the title, good Master, he seemed to check him by saying, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but One, that is God." By this interrogation and assertion, Christ did not design to deny his claim to goodness, not even to divine goodness. It appears that the young man was not apprehensive that Christ was divine; that he viewed him only as a man of more than ordinary endowments; that he viewed him as a prophet. According to the young man's apprehension of Christ he gave him a title higher than he deserved; though not higher than he really deserved. On this ground Christ made his reply.

The Jews formed their ideas of God from the same titles, attributes, or *characters*, which are applied to Christ. If they had evidence from this source that there was a God, there is the same evidence that Christ is God. Had only a single divine title or attribute been ascribed to Christ, there would have been ground to suspect that they were applied to him figuratively, or applied to him as they have been applied to men. But when it is considered that all divine titles and attributes, except those which distinguish the Father from the Son, in their relationship or in their distinct offices, are applied to Christ, it is impossible to account for their just application without admitting that he is divine. It pleased the Father that in him should *all fulness* dwell. In him dwelt

all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. He is the express image of his person; the very *character* of his substance. If there were no plurality in the divine nature, which is the ground of the distinctions, Father and Son, it appears to be improper to say that in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead. If, on this principle, *all* divine fulness dwelt in him, there would be no ground for addressing divinity out of himself. There would be no ground of his addressing the Father. If the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ, divine nature and divine attributes dwelt in him; otherwise, *all the fulness* of the Godhead did not dwell in him; he was not the *character* of divine nature.

If God made communications to Christ as he did to the prophets, only in a greater degree, he would not possess one divine attribute. Divine *fulness* would not dwell in him. If there be no ground of distinction in the divine nature, and God should communicate his *fulness* to the man Christ Jesus, he would only change his condition, (if the expression may be allowed) but there would be no ground of distinction between the Father and the Son; nor would there be ground for one to address the other. It is absurd to say that Christ possesses divine attributes only in a limited degree. Divine attributes are infinite, or in the greatest possible degree. What is less is not divine. If this be not true, it is impossible to draw a line of distinction between human and divine attributes.

As divine attributes are as clearly and fully ascribed to the Son as they are to the Father; and as a nature is known only by its attributes, it follows that there is as clear evidence, from this source, of the divine nature of the Son, as of the Father.*

* Who being the express image of his person. χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. Heb. 1:3. These original words signify *the character of his substance.* A character is an exact representation of the seal or stamp, which makes the impression. They are of the same dimensions; and they perfectly correspond in all their parts. According to the perfection of the former, so is the perfection of the latter. If Christ represents the Father as a character represents its seal, there is an exact correspondence between them. They are of the same extent. Their attributes are correspondent, and of equal perfection. If Christ

be of finite nature and finite properties, there is no proportion, there is no correspondence between him and the Father, who is of infinite perfection. If extraordinary powers were *delegated* to him, they would make no addition to his nature; and of course they would not make him the character, or exact likenes of the Father's substance.

"Before Abraham was, I am." John 8:58. We produce this text, not to prove the eternal existence of the Son, but to prove his pre-existence. Attempts have been made to evade even this proof from the text. It is contended that Christ did not design to convey an idea that he had existence before Abraham, but that before his day he was appointed by the counsel of Heaven to the office of Messiah; that he was ordained to be the Christ. If this be the meaning of the text, he gave a very indirect answer to the question of the Jews. Their inquiry related to his age; and if his answer related to the time of his appointment to office, there is not the least connexion between the answer and the question. Rather than to suppose this prevarication, we would use the text according to its most easy and natural construction; that Christ was before Abraham.

"Glorify thou me with thine ownself, with the glory, which I had with thee before the world was." John 17:5. This text is offered to prove Christ's pre-existence only. It is an unhappy evasion to say that this glory, which Christ once had with the Father, and for which he prayed, was a glory, which was *reserved* for him, which was in the Father's purpose and decree. It could not, with truth be said that he ever *had* a glory, which was only *reserved* or *purposed* for him. Besides, if he prayed for this degree of glory, he would pray only for a glory to be kept in *reserve* or *purpose;* for this, upon the present hypothesis, is the glory he had with the Father.

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." Rev. 22:13. It is admitted by Unitarians that these are the words of Christ. The terms, first and last, are applied in the Old Testament to God. If these terms, when applied to him, express his eternal existence, they equally express the eternal existence of Christ, when applied to him. It is admitted that many words in the scriptures, which, according to their natural meaning, are taken in their greatest latitude, are restricted by their application. But there is no restriction, or qualification intimated, when the terms first and last are applied to Christ. To say "they signify that Jesus Christ, is contemporary with the earliest and latest events in that dispensation, over which he has been ordained by the Almighty to preside," is begging the question. It is assuming that he had no authority, or that he did not preside over any thing till he commenced the dispensation of mercy with mankind. When the prophet Isaiah applies the same terms to the God of Israel, some captious critic might as well say, they signify that God is contemporary with the earliest and latest events of the Jewish dispensation. With such license, it would be impossible to prove one divine attribute of God the Father.

"But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from *everlasting*." Micah 5:2. The original words standing for "shall he come forth," and "whose goings forth," are radically the same. It is contended that the first, signifies his birth at Bethlehem; and that "the last clause must therefore be understood thus: "*whose birth* has been of old from everlasting;" i. e. "whose birth has been determined, or appointed from everlasting." Even though the expression, "*goings forth*," should be referred to an earlier period of our Lord's existence than his birth from the Virgin Mary, it must signify *generation* in some way or other, and therefore favors the Unitarian doctrine, that he had a *beginning*, rather than the orthodox opinion of his eternity." (See Yates' Vindication of Unitarianism.)

This learned author makes the assumption, that the phrase, "shall he come forth," signifies his natural birth. The original word does not necessarily signify *birth*. It is *sometimes* applied to it. But it is also "applied to the productions of the earth, or of vegetables; to the solar lights going forth upon the earth; so to the stellar lights, to the springing, or coming forth of waters; to come or go forth, or out, in almost any manner." (See Park. Heb. Lex. on the word.) "Out of *thee*," i. e. *Bethlehem*, "shall he come forth to me." However common the supposition may be, it is hard to conceive that Christ's coming forth out of the city Bethlehem to his Father, should signify his natural

birth. But if this supposition were correct, and the latter phrase, "*his goings forth*," signified the same thing, the inference would be, that he had a natural birth before he was born of Mary. As the latter phrase is in the plural number, it would follow that he had had several natural births before that time. The learned author, however, only infers that "it must signify *generation in some way or other*." But this is making the conclusion broader than the premises. To apply the first phrase to his natural birth, and the latter to an unintelligible generation, is neither agreeable to sound logic, nor to the rules of strict criticism. The LXX did not understand, by the original terms, any kind of birth or generation. If we understand the terms according to their natural and true import, as they stand in our translation, we shall find that he, who came forth from Bethlehem on his Father's business, had also gone forth from him, from of old, from everlasting.

"Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Heb. 13:8. It is contended by some that Jesus Christ, in this text, is put for the doctrines which he taught; and that this text proves not the immutability of his nature; but only the immutability of his doctrines. It is admitted that his name is *sometimes* used to signify his religion. But it does not follow from this that it is *always* used in this sense, or that it is so used in this passage. But if this were the true meaning of the text, it would afford some evidence of his immutability. If he be the Author and Supporter of an unchangeable religion; if his kingdom be of one nature, and his laws and administration be without essential variation, there is strong evidence that he himself does not essentially change. If his designs are always the same, there is no reasonable doubt that he is always the same. In the former part of the epistle to the Hebrews, the apostle, after attributing the work of creation to the Son, asserts his immutability by the same terms, thou art the same (ὁ αυτος.) To speak of the visible changes, which Christ sustained during his humiliation is mere evasion. It is to speak of the mutability of his humanity, which all admit.

"No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven." John 3:13. Trinitarian commentators are not agreed in their explanations of this text. It appears, however, that the first clause cannot be understood literally. For Enoch and Elijah were taken up bodily into heaven. The connexion of this text authorizes a belief that Christ, by his declaration, "no man hath ascended up to heaven," designed to shew that no person beside himself was fully acquainted with the counsel of heaven. He positively asserted that he spoke what he *knew*, and testified what he had *seen*. He knew and he had seen what mere man never knew nor saw. If the first part of the text is understood figuratively, there is no *necessity* of understanding the second clause in this manner. Other texts, without the appearance of a figure, assert that he came down from heaven. Christ himself says, "I came down from heaven." The Jews understood him to speak literally; for they said, "is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know, how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?" The apostle Paul, speaking of Christ's ascension, saith, "now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also, that ascended up far above all heavens."

The latter part of the text, "the Son of man, who is in heaven," naturally conveys the idea that he, who had descended from heaven, and was then speaking, was also in heaven. This construction is easy, if it be admitted that divinity was united with the Son of man. If this union be denied it is difficult to explain this passage.

"They went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following," Mark 16:20. "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," Mat. 18:20. "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," Matt. 28:20. A learned Unitarian, (see Yates' Vindication of Unitarianism, p. 225,) admits that these texts "prove, that he was *virtually present* with his disciples, to guard, comfort, and assist them in their apostolic labors." To prove his omnipresence, he considers it necessary to shew that his substance is extended through all space. This extension of substance he considers to be the omnipresence of God. The distinction between *actual* and *virtual* omnipresence of God is a subject better calculated for the speculations of metaphysicians than for the discussion of theologians. Let the conclusion be which way it will, the effect will be the same. Whether he be *actually* or *virtually* present, it is in

(or rather by) him we live, move, and have our being. We know too little of spiritual substance to have definite conceptions of its extension, or of its relation to place. We cannot define the limits of our spirits; but we have reason to believe that we have perceptions, and we produce effects far beyond the extension of our material or spiritual substance. If a finite spirit can produce effects where its substance does not actually extend, it does not appear to be *necessary* to suppose that the substance of the divine Spirit should be actually extended wherever he operates. If it be admitted that the virtual presence of Christ is "with his disciples, to guard, comfort, and assist them in their apostolic labors," it is believed that the presence of God with them is not superior to this, either in its nature, or in its effects; and till it *is proved* to be superior, there appears to be no presumption in the belief. We do not maintain that these texts alone prove Christ's *universal* presence; but they appear to prove his presence to be of such a nature, that it may as well extend to every other creature. But we are not left to inference on this subject The apostle expressly tells us, "by him *all things* consist," Col. 1:17. "Upholding *all things* by the word of his power," Heb. 1:3. These texts prove, (and it is presumed it will be admitted) that Christ's *virtual* presence is as extensive as the works of creation; and till it is proved that the presence of God the Father is more extensive and of a higher nature, we shall call it omnipresence, and a divine attribute.

"Now we are sure that thou knowest *all* things and needest not that any man should ask thee." John 16:30. "But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man," John 2:24, 25.

"Lord, which *knowest the hearts of all men*, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen," Acts 1:24. It is probable that the address in the last verse quoted was made to Christ. It was his province, while he was upon earth to designate men to the apostleship. After his resurrection his authority was not abridged. So far from it that all authority in heaven and in earth was given unto him. Of course he retained the authority of selecting and sending forth apostles. It was with peculiar propriety that they should direct their requests to him to designate which of the two candidates should fill the place, which Judas had vacated.

In these texts Christ is said to know *all things;* to know all men; to know what is in man. But we are told that "the word *all*, does not always denote strict universality." The very same phrase, of knowing all things, is used in application to men. "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things," 1 John 2:20. It is admitted that the word *all*, is sometimes used in the scriptures in a limited sense. Because it is *sometimes* used in this manner, it does not follow that it is *always* used so. Because it is used in a restricted sense, when it is applied to men, it does not follow that it is to be restricted, when it is applied to Jesus Christ. But we are not left to ambiguous terms and phrases to prove the divine knowledge of Christ. He is said to know what was in man At different times he gave evidence that he possessed this knowledge. But we are told that this knowledge might be revealed to him; that "numerous instances of this occur in scripture." Ahijah the prophet, although blind through age, was inspired to know the wife of Jeroboam and the intentions of her heart, notwithstanding she feigned herself another. It is asserted, concerning Elijah the prophet, that he could tell the things, which the king of Israel should do in his bed chamber; an expression denoting a knowledge of the most secret transactions. Much in point is the declaration of Elisha. And the man of God said, "Let her alone, for her soul is vexed within her; and the Lord hath hidden it from me, and hath not told me." We have a memorable instance in the Acts of the Apostles, in which Peter knew by inspiration, that Ananias had kept back part of the price of the land, though he declared he had not; and, also, that he and his wife had secretly agreed to maintain the falsehood. "My lord is wise according to the wisdom of an angel of God, to know all things that are in the earth."

These are particular cases of extraordinary knowledge. In the case of Ahijah, it is expressly asserted, that the Lord told him the errand and the deception of Jeroboam's wife. In respect to Elisha's knowledge of the words, which the king of Syria spoke in his bed chamber, it is only a declaration of a servant of the Syrian king. But admitting his declaration to be literally true, it only proves that a *particular* fact was revealed to him. When the Shunamite went unto Elisha with the sad tidings of the death of her son, he did not know her errand;

and for this reason, the Lord had hid it from him, and had not told him. This implies that when he had extraordinary knowledge, it was by inspiration. It is not recorded *how* Peter knew the secret deception of Ananias and his wife. But there is no doubt that he received knowledge of this event, from Him, who gave him power to heal a lame man. When the widow of Tekoah perceived that David had discovered her deception; and convinced of his sagacity, she in a complimentary manner compared him with an angel of God to know all things that are in the earth. In all these instances, extraordinary knowledge was communicated by the divine Being. But these communications were made only in *particular* cases, and for *special* purposes. Those men, who were thus endowed, had not a knowledge of the hearts of men generally, nor had they a knowledge of a single heart at all times.

Christ's knowledge appears very different from this. He knew not only a particular thought of a particular person, but he knew *all* men; and needed not that *any* should testify of man; for he knew what was in man. This text expresses his knowledge of what is in the hearts of mankind; and he possesses this knowledge without *any one's* testifying to him what passes in the human mind. There is no intimation given that he received this knowledge by inspiration. This and some other texts, which are applied to Christ, are as expressive of divine knowledge, as any texts, which are applied to the Father. But we are told, there are texts, which represent Christ's knowledge to be inferior to the Father's, or to be derived from him. It is admitted there are two classes of texts, which are applied to Christ. One class represents him having knowledge, which is peculiar to Deity. Another class represents him having limited knowledge; having knowledge, or doctrines, given, shewn, taught him from above. These two classes of texts exhibit Christ in his divine and human nature. When things are said to be given, shewn, and taught to Christ, he is either exhibited in his humanity, or in his mediatorial, subordinate office. When Christ says, "The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things, that himself doeth," he asserts his perfect knowledge of *all* the operations of the Father; and also the intimate union, which subsists between them. To express their equality of knowledge in unequivocal language he says, "*As* the Father knoweth me, *even* so know I the Father."

"I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works," Rev. 2:23. It will not be pretended that Christ searcheth, by inspiration, the reins and hearts. A person may be inspired with a knowledge of what passes in another's heart; but it is not proper to say, one is inspired to search his heart. But it is asserted that power may be delegated to Christ for this purpose; and it is supposed he "will at the day of general judgment be endued with all the knowledge of men's thoughts and dispositions, which is necessary to the discharge of his office." Let it be observed, that a text in the book of Jeremiah predicates of God the same power. "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." Now let it be asked why the same unqualified words, when Christ applies them to himself, do not import the same power, as when God applies them to himself? By what rule are they to be restricted in one case, and not in the other? A delegation of power to a creature to know all things is an impartation entirely disproportionate to the capacity of the recipient. Christ, to express his union and equality with the Father, says, "What things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." At the same time he disclaimed all pretensions to acting separately from him.

CHRIST THE AUTHOR OF CREATION.

All things were made *by* him, and *without* him was not *any thing* made that was made. John 1: 3. There are various sources, from which information may be derived respecting the nature of beings. Something may be learned from their names. Something may be learned from their attributes; and much may be learned from their operations. Those exercises, which are limited in degree and in extent, are justly attributed to finite beings. Those exercises, which are unlimited in degree and extent, or are in the highest possible degree, characterize a nature of infinite power. In the chain of visible existences there is a visible chain of dependencies. Those limited powers, which are discovered, are dependent; and may be traced to a power, as their origin, which is independent. This power resides in a nature, which is distinct from all other natures, and is superior to them. It resides in a nature, which alone is divine. That power, from which all other power originated, is infinite and independent. This power is attributed to the Son of God, and it designates his divinity.

The apostle Paul, in one place says that God made the worlds by Jesus Christ. In another place he says, by him he created all things. From this mode of expression it has been inferred that the Son had no inherent power in his nature adequate to the work of creation; that he was merely an instrument in God's

hand, by which he performed this great work. The phrase, by him (δι αυτου) has been considered importing an *instrumental*, but not an *efficient* cause. But this phrase does not necessarily import mere instrumentality; nor does it usually import it in the sacred scriptures. The same particle is connected with the Father and with the Holy Spirit, as well as with the Son. The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts *by* the Holy Ghost. The apostle Paul speaking of God says, "Of him and *by* him, and to him are all things." If the particle (δι) connected with God and the Holy Ghost, does not import instrumentality, it does not *necessarily* import it, when it is applied to the Son. The same particle repeatedly imports, in the sacred scriptures, the principle and efficient cause. After Peter had healed a lame man, he ascribed the cure to the power of the Son of God as its cause. "The faith, which is *by him*, hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all." Christ was the *Author* of this faith; and this faith was the instrumental or secondary cause of the cure. The apostle Paul, speaking of Christ, says, "*By whom* we have received grace and apostleship." The scriptures abundantly testify that Christ is the Author, or cause of grace and apostleship. Paul, in his salutation to the Galatians begins thus, Paul, an apostle not of men, neither by man, but *by Jesus Christ* and God the Father. The same efficiency is ascribed to the Holy Spirit. "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who *by* (δι) the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." "God is faithful, *by whom* (δι ου) ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. It became him for whom are all things, and *by whom* (δι ου) are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." From this indiscriminate use and application of the terms, *by him*, it follows that they do not *necessarily* import mere instrumentality.

The common use of the term, as well as the scripture use, shews that the particle by (δι) is often connected with the principal agent, or efficient cause.

It is not only said in scripture that God created the worlds *by* Jesus Christ; but it is also said that *all things* were made by him; and the word God, is not connected with the declaration. There is no doubt that these different forms of expressing the same thing were not accidental; but were designed to express the co-operation of the Father and the Son in the work of creation. Christ frequently declared his union and co-operation with the Father. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work. What things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. He that sent me is with me; the Father hath not left me alone. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me." These passages in their connexion prove the union and operation of Christ with the Father. (See Macknight, and Schleusner's Lex. on δι.)

Other passages of scripture, whose signification does not turn on prepositions or doubtful expressions, ascribe the work of creation to Christ. In the Revelation of St. John, Christ is called "the beginning of the creation of God." The original word (αρχη) rendered beginning, is used in different senses. It signifies efficient cause, author, or head. (See Poole on the text.) Upon this construction, which is the most natural, the text proves that Christ was Author of Creation. (αρχή Christus vocatur, quia fuit ante omnes res cuatas. Schleus. Lex.) If any doubt remain respecting the translation of this word, other texts offer their assistance to prove the subject under consideration. Christ saith of himself, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." This text authorizes a belief that there is such a union between the Father and the Son, that the same work may be ascribed to both. All things are *of* the Father,

but they are *by* the Son. All the works of nature may be traced to them both as one undivided Cause.

Another passage is clearly to the present purpose. "By him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth; whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers; all things were created *by* him, and *for* him; and he is *before* all things and by him all things consist," Col. 1: 16, 17. These texts describe the extent of his works. *All things*, whether in heaven or in earth, visible or invisible, were created by him. They were not only created *by* him, but they were created *for* him. He was not only the cause of their existence, but he was the ultimate object, for which they were created. They were made for his service and glory. His power did not cease to operate at the close of creation; but it continued in sustaining the works of his hand. "By him all things *consist;*" i. e. are supported. He was before all things. Before creatures were, he was. *He was begotten before the whole creation.* (πρωτότοκος πασης κτίσεως.) Of course he was not himself any part of creation. (Christus vocatur πρωτοτοκος πασης κτίσεως princeps & dominus omnium rerum creatarum. Schleus. Lex.)

The apostle to the Hebrews ascribes the work of creation to Christ in the clearest terms. Speaking of Christ, he says, "Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old, as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." The connexion justly admits of application to no other than to Christ. But the prophet says, "The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth shall perish." This makes a visible distinction between Christ and the gods of this world. The same, which the apostle applies to Christ, the Psalmist applies to God. If, what the Psalmist says has any weight in proof that God created the

world, it has the same weight of proof that Christ created the world. The whole declaration is explicit. It contains none of those prepositions (δία, εν, &c.) which have been construed to answer any purpose. If plain language has any weight, there is proof that the Son is the Creator of the world. "Some have been willing to think, and bold enough to say, that these four verses were fraudulently added, and were not originally a part of this epistle. But all the copies and ancient versions of this epistle retain these four verses; so that any pretence of forgery or interpolation does but expose the man that makes it, and the cause that needs it."

Many other texts have a direct bearing upon this subject, and prove that the sacred scriptures attribute the work of creation to Jesus Christ. Notwithstanding the scriptures are so explicit on this subject, a question has arisen whether Christ created the world by his own inherent power, or whether he created it merely as an instrument, or by power delegated to him. If he was divine, or if divine nature was united with his humanity, he performed, by his own power, the works attributed to him. If he was not divine, or if this union did not subsist, he performed his works by delegated, or borrowed power. God maketh his angels ministering spirits. He sometimes deputizes man to act in a more elevated sphere than that, for which his native powers had qualified him. The prophets and apostles were endued in this manner. God led Israel by the hand of Moses. By him he wrought miracles. By his prophets and apostles he also wrought miracles. If there be no difference in the nature, decree and circumstances between their works, and the works of Christ, then it may be admitted that he was but a man, furnished with extraordinary power, as were the prophets and apostles.

When they exhibited signs and wonders; when they performed works, which exceeded the efforts of human power, they never pretended to do them in their own

names, nor by their own native strength. When they wrought miracles, they addressed a power foreign from themselves. When Paul had healed a cripple by saying, "Stand upright on thy feet," the Lycaonians reputed him as a god; and would have offered him sacrifice. But he denied all claim to divine honors; all claim to any thing above humanity. When any prophet or apostle wrought miracles, there was always clear and decided evidence that he acted entirely under authority; that he acted under the operation of a power, which was occasionally communicated to him for special purposes.

But Christ performed greater works. He performed them with higher authority, and under different circumstances. "Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands. All things were made by him and without him was not any thing made that was made." The first of these two passages was not designed to convey the idea that Christ created the world exclusively of the Father and Holy Spirit. In the history of the creation it is said, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It is worthy of notice, that the original word in this text rendered God, is in the plural number; and is used uniformly in the plural number through the whole history of the creation. This plural noun embraces the divine nature generally. It embraces the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Creation is ascribed to them collectively; it is also ascribed to them individually, (Heb. 1:2. John 1:3. Psalm 33:6, and 104:30.) There appears to be no ground for ascribing the work of creation to the Father exclusively, primarily, or officially. There appears to be no ground for ascribing it to the Son, or to the Spirit, under either of these qualifications. All those works, recorded in the scriptures, which do not immediately and directly include the work of redemption, are attributed to God, to divine nature in plurality, without *special* regard to dis-

tinction of character, of order, or of office. They are, of course, attributed with the strictest propriety either to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. There is design, wise design in exhibiting the works of creation in this manner. It conveys the idea that there is but one God; that there is a distinct plurality in the divine nature; that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are divine; that they are united in nature; in design; and in operation.

When the scriptures represent God creating the world *by* Jesus Christ, they do not design that it should be understood that Christ was a mere instrument in the work. The original word, (δι) translated *by*, often signifies, or implies in the sacred scriptures an efficient cause of any kind. Consequently, this mode of expression helps to prove that Christ, by his own inherent power was author of creation. The same original word often signifies, and is often translated *in*. With this signification of the word, it would be understood that God created the world *in* Jesus Christ. This would be an evidence of the union, which subsists in the divine plurality.

There is the clearest evidence that the sacred writings attribute creation to Jesus Christ. This forms an argument to prove that he is divine; for the scriptures attribute divinity to the Creator. "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." As the works of creation prove the eternal power and divinity of their Creator; and as Christ is their Creator, it follows that he possesses eternal power and divinity. "Hezekiah prayed before the Lord and said, O Lord God of Israel, which dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou, alone of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth." In this passage Hezekiah ascribes the works of creation to God alone. As the same works are ascribed to Christ, it follows that Christ is God. "Thus saith the

Lord, the Holy One of Israel and his Maker,—I have made the earth and created man upon it; I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens and all their host have I commanded." Whether the names Lord, Holy One, and Maker, in this text stand for the Trinity or not, creation is attributed to the Lord; to the Holy One of Israel. As Christ is proved to be Creator, it follows that Christ is Lord, the Holy One of Israel.

There is no *necessity* of supposing that Jesus Christ is a subordinate or instrumental agent in the work of creation. If it be admitted that there is a plurality in the divine nature, it is easy to perceive that the creation of all things may be attributed with equal propriety to the Son, as to the Father.

It is not *necessary* that God should employ an instrument in the work of creation. Almighty power needs no foreign aid. He can and does accomplish all his pleasure, and none can stay his hand. There is no intimation in the history of creation that God employed a subordinate agent. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. God said, let there be light and there was light." There is not the least appearance of any medium through which he operated.

In the formation of the first creature, it is *impossible* that God should operate through the medium of any agent. There was a date in duration, in which there was no agent, or active medium between self-existence and non-existence. The first creature, therefore, was necessarily made by the *immediate* act of God. There is no intimation given in the scriptures that the first creature was formed in a manner different from succeeding creatures. It is written, "*All things* were made by him, (i. e. Christ;) and *without* him was not any thing made that was made. As he made *all things*, he, of course, made the first creature. If he made the first creature without an instrumental medium, he was able to make them all in the same manner.

It is absurd to suppose that Christ was a *created medium*, through which God made the world; because,

without him was not any thing made that was made. If Christ were a mere creature, he must, if this text be true, have created himself, which is absurd. If God used a medium in the formation of the world, it must have been a created one. If he made it a passive instrument, the work could not properly be attributed to the instrumental medium. If God should make an absolute impartation of creative power to a creature, he would divest himself of that power; and the creature would possess the prerogative of divinity. Such inconsistency proves that God did not create the world through the medium of a subordinate agent, but that he made it immediately by his own power.*

* Mr. Yates maintains "that when a New Testament writer employs the preposition ΔΙΑ, (with a genitive case) to point out the cause of any effect, he means the *instrumental* cause, and refers to some other being, either expressly mentioned, or contemplated, who is considered as the *first*, or *original* cause." In view of this principle let us examine a few of many texts. "It must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man, *by whom* (δι' οὗ) the offence cometh," Mat. 18: 7. This learned Unitarian remarks thus upon this passage. "*It must needs be.*"—"Who imposed the necessity? Undoubtedly, the Almighty Creator and Governor of the universe." We would inquire, was this *imposed* necessity natural, or moral? If it was moral, how could it be *imposed?* Or how could it consist with the efficiency of an extraneous "original cause?" If the necessity was natural, if it was imposed by "the Almighty Creator and Governor of the universe—as the first or original cause," what then is man? He is but the medium, or instrument, through which divine power produced the offence. What! Is God then the author of sin? Has the subject come to this dilemma, that Christ possessed creative, i. e. divine power, or moral evil must be traced up to God, as its original cause? I would rather believe the mystery of the Trinity, than believe that the holy nature of God is the "original cause" of moral evil.

"Woe to that man, by whom (δι' οὗ) the Son of man is betrayed," Mat. 26: 24, "Was Judas also," (says Mr. Yates) "an original cause? Was then the salvation of the world by the death of Christ left to depend upon the supreme power and uncontrolled discretion of an insignificant mortal? The scriptures teach a very contrary doctrine. He was *betrayed by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.*"

"By one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin," Rom. 5:12. "The clear meaning of the apostle's words (says Mr. Yates) is, that sin entered into the world by the decree of God, through one man as his instrument, and death through sin."

This learned Unitarian appears to be unwilling to allow that a creature is the efficient cause of any effect, but that he is only a medium, through which divine power operates. We shall not here examine whether this hypothesis destroys moral agency or not. But he does not appear to make a distinction between the natural powers of a creature, and those powers, which are supernaturally communicated. He does not appear to distinguish the nature of the act of Moses in killing an Egyptian, from that of dividing the Red Sea. In the latter case he was the *instrumental*, in the former, he was the *efficient* cause. The conclusion we would draw from the foregoing remarks is this, that Christ, in the work of creation, and in the performance of miracles, wrought by his own natural power, and not by power which was extraordinarily communicated to him; and it may be added, the Greek particle, which is connected with him as agent does not militate against this opinion.

Had the Greek preposition ΥΠΟ been used in connexion with Christ instead of *διὰ*, the case would not be materially different, as Mr. Yates supposes. For this preposition is frequently connected with created beings to express their efficiency. See Mat. 2: 16. Mat. 3: 6, 13. Mat. 4: 1, and many other places.

In the case under consideration, there appears to be a similarity between the idiom of the Greek, and the idiom of our own language. We say, an illustrious deed is performed *by* a certain man; and we say, a certain man has performed an illustrious deed. We consider the expressions equivalent. In like manner, it appears to be the same thing, whether it be said, all things were made *by* Christ, or he made all things. In 1 Cor. 1:9, the preposition *διὰ* is connected with God. "God is faithful, *by whom* ye were called into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord." This shews that this Greek particle is connected with an efficient cause. Also in Heb. 2:10, *δι* is connected with the Father. "For it became him, for whom are all things, and *by whom* (*δι ὃν*) are all things," &c. This latter text, Mr. Yates has passed unnoticed.

CHRIST POSSESSES DIVINE AUTHORITY.

CHRIST, in union of operation with the Father and the Holy Spirit, created the world; and held authority in common with them. Had creatures preserved order, and yielded obedience to their Creator, it is probable that the distinctions in the divine nature, which are manifested by the titles and characters of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, would have lain forever concealed from the view of created intelligences. Revelation has proved that it was the divine purpose to repair the ruins of the fall, and subdue all enemies. To effectuate this purpose it was *necessary* that different offices should be established, and different works be assigned to each of the sacred Trinity. This method is said to be *necessary*, because this method was chosen; is revealed; and is in actual operation. Authority, by reciprocal consent, was given to each to act in his respective office. This giving and receiving of authority implies no superiority of nature in one; nor does it imply any essential loss or acquisition of power in the other. Christ's official, or mediatorial authority commenced immediately after the apostasy. No communications have been made from heaven to this fallen world, excepting by him.

The Son of God did not exercise mediatorial authority to the greatest extent till after his resurrection. The union of human and divine nature was essential to the complete filling of this office. Though there was no alteration in Christ's divinity in the different

stages of the work of redemption; yet there was alteration in his humanity. He was made perfect through suffering, (Heb. 2:10.) When he had suffered the pains of death and had risen to life, he was fully capacitated; and he received authority for every part of the work of the mediatorial office. It was then he said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." This text ought to have been translated, All *authority* is given unto me in heaven and in earth. His divine power always was and always will be the same. But his mediatorial authority had its beginning; its progress; and it will have its consummation. When he shall have raised the dead; when he shall have "gathered together in one the children of God;" when all things are put under his feet, then will he give up his kingdom, his mediatorial kingdom to God, even the Father. Having accomplished his mediatorial work, having given up those, whom the Father had given him, he will relinquish all that rule and authority, which he *received*. "When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." Christ may be said to be subject to him, who put all things under him in a comparative view. In comparison with that mediatorial authority, which he once had, but which he relinquishes at the judgment day, he may be said to be subject; or subjects himself to that state, which he before occupied. When the work of redemption is completed; when that kingdom, which was purchased with the price of blood is given up, there will be no need of the intervention of a Mediator; those offices, which are peculiar to the work of redemption will cease; and God in plurality (אלהים) who created the world will hold the reins of government. The kingdom of saints will be an everlasting kingdom; and the dominion over it, like the work of creation, may, with strict propriety be ascribed to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit.

Thus God will be all in all as he was before the apostasy.

When it is said that *all* authority is given unto Christ, it is not designed to convey an idea that the Father and the Holy Spirit did not retain *any* authority. The import of the text is, Christ received all authority, which was necessary to effectuate the work of redemption; that work, for which he came into the world. The word *all* is frequently used in the scriptures in a restricted sense.

It is necessary to take a more particular view of Christ's authority, as it is exercised in the various departments of the mediatorial office. He exercises authority over holy and fallen angels. As they both affect his kingdom, it is pertinent to view his dominion in relation to them. "All *authority* is given unto me in heaven." If this text does not extend Christ's authority to fallen spirits, other passages assign him this extent of authority. It was early predicted that Christ should bruise the serpent's head. At a time the devil, under advantageous circumstances, tempted Christ. But with authority he repelled him and prevailed against him. At various times he cast out evil spirits, and sent them whither he pleased. At a time they called upon his name, that he would not torment them; and they inquired of him whether he had come to torment them *before the time;* which implied that there would be a time, in which he would have authority to torment them. When the seventy returned from their mission, they said unto Christ, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through *thy* name." Christ took upon himself flesh and blood and suffered death, that through death he might destroy *him* that had the power of death, that is, *the devil.*

Christ has also authority over the holy angels. God set his Son "far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." When Christ was upon earth angels *minis-*

tered unto him. When he shall come to raise the dead and judge the world, angels will attend him; and he will *send* them to gather the elect from the four winds. The apostle Paul speaking of Christ says, "Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him. God hath highly exalted him and given him a name, which is *above every name;* that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in *heaven*, and things in earth, and things under the earth." The holy angels are concerned with the work of redemption. They desire to look into it. They are ministering spirits, "sent forth to minister for them, who shall be heirs of salvation." They are employed by the great Head of the Church as instruments in his work.

Christ's authority in heaven extends to the sending of the Holy Spirit into this world to aid the work of redemption. John the Baptist foretold that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Ghost. Christ himself promised, that after his departure from the world, he would *send* the Holy Spirit. "When the Comforter is come, *whom I will send* unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me. It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will *send* him unto you." After Christ's ascension, and agreeably to his declaration, he *sent* the Holy Spirit. At a time, when Peter was preaching Christ, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word." On the day of Pentecost, when the apostles were together, "there appeared unto them cloven tongues, as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." These texts prove that Christ has authority to *send* the Holy Spirit into the hearts of sinners for their conversion; and into the hearts of saints for their comfort.

All the prophets and apostles, which have taught mankind the will of heaven, were *sent* by Christ, and were under his authority. It was Christ, who appeared unto Moses, and *sent* him to lead Israel out of Egypt. It was Christ, who *sent* the Spirit of prophecy to the prophets, by which they taught the people, and foretold events. After Christ appeared in the world, in human flesh, he selected men, qualified them and commissioned them to preach the gospel. When Christ was teaching the multitude and his disciples, he said, "Neither be ye called masters; for one is your *Master*, even Christ." Here the Savior claims an authority over men, which he did not allow to men. He called his twelve disciples unto him; gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness. He *sent* them forth; he directed them where to go; what to preach, and he foretold what would befal them. He declares himself to be the *Door*, through which his shepherds shall go in unto the sheep. This denotes that they derive all their authority from him. The apostle Paul acknowledged that he received his commission from the Lord Jesus. "That I might finish my course with joy, and the *ministry*, which I have *received* of the *Lord Jesus*." The apostle Paul expresses entire dependence on Christ, for spiritual strength. He says, "I can do all things;" but he adds, "*through Christ strengthening me*." When he besought the Lord that the messenger of Satan might depart from him, the Lord answered, "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." The apostle adds, "most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the *power of Christ* may rest upon me." He acknowledges himself and the other apostles to be ambassadors for Christ. Paul and the other apostles, in their salutations to the churches to which they wrote, style themselves the servants or apostles of Jesus Christ.

The apostles not only received their ministry from the Lord Jesus, and acted under him; but they must give an account to him. The Master of these servants will return and reckon with them. They must stand before the judgment seat of Christ. The Lord said to his disciples, "Watch ye therefore, and pray always that ye may be accounted worthy....to stand before the Son of man." The apostle Paul said, "To me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you or of man's judgment. He, who judgeth me is the Lord;" that is, Christ.

Christ possesses a decided and a distinguishing superiority over his prophets, priests, and apostles. The apostle, contrasting him with Moses, gives him a striking pre-eminence. "This man, (said he, speaking of Christ) was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he, who hath builded the house, hath more honor than the house." If the prophets had the distinguishing honor of foretelling the advent of the Messiah, he had the greater honor of being the *object* of their predictions.

The priesthood under the law, was temporary and mutable; but Christ had an unchangeable priesthood. The priests, who attended at the altar, offered sacrifices continually for the people; and they first offered sacrifice for themselves. But their sacrifices could not take away sin. Christ "needed not as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins and then for the people's." "But after he had offered *one* sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God. For by *one* offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

The apostles acknowledge Christ's superiority. He is the *great, the chief* Shepherd. They are subordinate shepherds. They feed the sheep, which he purchased. The apostle saith, "we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." He appeared to glory in

humbling himself, and in ascribing all excellence and authority to his divine Master.

The kingdom of Christ will not be perfected till he has raised the dead. His mediatorial authority therefore, embraces the resurrection. When he was upon earth he gave evidence of this authority. In several instances he raised the dead. Of himself he said, "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again." "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. But he spake of the temple of his body. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." Jesus saith of himself, "I am the resurrection and the life. I say unto you the hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." This is the testimony, both by word and deed, which Christ has given of himself respecting the resurrection of the dead.

Some passages of scripture ascribe resurrection of the dead to the Father and to the Son indiscriminately. "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." Christ, when he was upon earth, raised certain individuals from the dead. As he performed this same kind of work, which the Father had performed; as he performed it in cases, in which he *would*, there was the highest evidence that he possessed divine power and divine authority. When the resurrection is attributed exclusively to the Son of God it is the general resurrection at the last day.

After Christ has raised the dead, he will sit in judgment, and pass sentence upon their characters. Christ saith all things are delivered unto me of my Father. The apostle Paul saith, "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man, whom he hath ordained. He commanded us to preach unto the people and to testify that it is he, which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick

and dead. We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. Before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats. The Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."

When Christ passes sentence on the human race, he has authority to confer reward on the righteous, and inflict punishment on the wicked. "Before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on the right hand, come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels, These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Near the close of the volume of inspiration Christ saith, "Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me, to give every man as his work shall be." Many other passages might be produced in further proof that Christ has authority to raise the dead and to administer retribution.

Because all authority was *given* to the Son; because he was *made* better than the angels, and *appointed* heir of all things; because the Father *committed* all judgment unto the Son and hath *ordained* him for this purpose, it has been inferred that he does not possess inherent qualifications for these great works and elevated offices; that he is only *constituted* to these works and offices; and endued with divine communications superior to those made to the prophets.

The great superiority which Christ holds over all the prophets and apostles affords but little ground for comparison. In comparison with angels, he hath obtained by *inheritance* a more excellent name than they. By *inheritance* he hath obtained a divine name. If it

be by *inheritance*, it is by right, not by favor or reward. If the Father and the Son are two separate and distinct beings, and the Father should communicate his *fulness* to the Son, the Son would possess the sum total of divinity; and the Father would retain only his name, without one divine attribute. He would possess no power to recal that fulness, which he had imparted. To have *authority* over all things in heaven and in earth; to have the government of angels and the power of sending the Holy Spirit; to have the superintendence of the Church universal and the direction of all its ministers; to raise the dead; to judge the world; to distribute reward and punishment proportionate to every character, must require attributes, mediately or immediately, which are divine. Christ, in all his works, appeared to act by his own power. His language was, "I will, be thou clean. Arise and walk. Thy sins are forgiven thee. Young man, I say unto thee arise. Lazarus, come forth." This is not the language of dependence. This is not the language of borrowed power. When the apostles wrought miracles, they attributed the *efficiency* to Jesus Christ; and they wrought in his name. When Peter was about to heal a lame man, he said, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk." To Eneas, who was sick of the palsy, he said, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole." Before he raised Dorcas, he prayed. When Paul healed a lame man, and the people reputed him as a god, he disclaimed the title, and arrogated no superior power to *himself*. It would have been highly improper for them to attribute their efficiency to Christ, if he had not an efficient power in himself.

It is hard to conceive why God should appoint a creature; vest him with authority; endue him with powers for the purpose of performing works and sustaining offices in the scheme of redemption, which divinity alone can perform and sustain. When the supreme power of a nation appoints a minister to treat

with another, he vests him with *authority* for the purpose; but he furnishes him with no extraordinary qualifications. When God appointed the Son to mediate between him and a rebellious world, he gave him *authority* to do the duties of that office. But he communicated to him no divine powers. For he needed no such communication. He was in his own nature, adequate to all the works, which were peculiar to a Redeemer. He knew the will of the Father; and what would satisfy his law. He knew all things in heaven and on earth. He knew what was in man; and he selected and qualified individuals, who acted under him in the great work of salvation. He had power in himself not only to lay down his own life and take it again; but he had power to raise the dead; and destroy him, that had the power of death. As he knows all things, and as he is righteous, he is competent to pass final judgment upon the human race, and distribute reward and punishment. Having power in his own nature to do these things, he did not need that any communications of divine power should be made to him. He only needed *authority*, that is, the appointment or consent of the Father to act in this capacity.

There appears to be no necessity that God should deputise a creature to do those divine works and sustain those divine offices, which Christ did and sustained. It appears that God might as well *directly* commission his ambassadors to publish the gospel and officiate in the church, as select one from his creatures and authorize him to commission them for this important work. When the chief magistrate of a state or nation appoints officers to act in various departments, and authorizes them to appoint subordinate officers, it is because he cannot attend to so great extent of business himself. But the divine Being is not circumscribed in his nature, nor limited in his attributes. His eye discerns all things. His power sustains all things. His wisdom directs all things. He *needs* no assistance. He admits

no partner on his throne. He communicates no divine prerogative to his creatures. It is not disputed that God employs agents; that he employs angels and men. But there is no evidence that he employs one to send another. If apostles were authorized to ordain others to the work of the Christian ministry, they ordained those only, who appeared to them to be *sent* of God. It is as easy for the divine Being to send ambassadors by his immediate power, as it would be to send them mediately by a *delegated* agent. It would be as easy for him to raise the dead and judge the world by his own immediate act, as it would be to do the same through the medium of one of his creatures.

There appears to be a striking impropriety that God should *ordain* any one of his creatures to do the works, and to do them in the manner, in which Christ did them. As great works as ever have been done are attributed to Christ; and there are no works to be done, which are mentioned in the scriptures, greater than those which he will do. These works he did, or will do, in his own name and by his own power. When any of mankind have performed works superior to human power, they gave decided evidence that the power was of God. If God communicated to Christ a power to work in his own name, he communicated an independent power. This is an essential attribute of the Deity. It is impossible to communicate divine attributes. As well may divine nature be destroyed, as divine attributes be communicated.

Many things are said of Christ, which appear to give him an inferiority to the Father. He increased in wisdom. Speaking of the end of the world he says, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels, which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." "I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father, which hath sent me." The time will come, when he will give up all authority and himself become subject. If these and the like passages gave the only characteristic features of the Savior, it

might well be supposed that he was inferior, infinitely inferior to the Father. But other texts attribute to him the highest degree of knowledge; they attribute to him every divine attribute. They not only style him King; but they give him a kingdom; yea, an everlasting dominion. When Christ is viewed in his humanity and in his mediatorial office, these difficulties, these *seeming* contrarieties vanish. "The man Christ Jesus increased in knowledge and wisdom. When he was baptized, the Holy Ghost descended upon him. When he departed from Jordan he was full of the Holy Ghost. He was led by the Spirit into the wilderness. God gave the Spirit, not by measure unto him. He anointed him with the oil of gladness above his fellows." These texts give abundant evidence that the Holy Spirit was bestowed in more copious effusions upon Jesus than upon the prophets or apostles. The descent, or unction of the Holy Ghost at his baptism was an inaugural rite to his office. In ancient times, kings and priests were introduced into their respective offices by the application of the anointing oil. As a prototype of these distinguished characters he was visibly introduced into his office by the anointing of the Holy Spirit. Christ, as a man, needed the extraordinary influence of the Spirit as much as any king, prophet, or priest; and in the performance of the duties of his offices, he received a greater degree of the Spirit's influence than they.

The descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus Christ did not convey divine nature to him. The Son of God was united to the Son of man. During this union he received the influence of the Holy Spirit. *After* his baptism, *after* his consecration to his office, it is recorded of him that he was full of the Holy Ghost. Christ, in his mediatorial office is subordinate to the Father. By mutual consent he has taken this place. But the order of offices does not derogate from his divinity.

When it is brought into one view that Christ had authority over the angels; authority to send the Holy Spirit; authority to send apostles and ministers, till the end of time, to preach the gospel for the edification of the church; authority to forgive sins, to raise the dead, to judge the world, and to give reward and punishment, there is evidence that there was ground in his nature for possessing such authority. There is evidence that he is divine.*

* There is a difference between ἐξουσία and δυναμίς; between authority and power. By observing this difference, we shall discover additional light on the subject. Power may be greater than authority; but authority cannot be, strictly speaking, greater than power. Both are transferable. Both were communicated to the apostles by the Lord Jesus. They were *enabled*, and they were *authorized* to work miracles. *Power* was communicated to Jesus. In his human nature he was capable of receiving foreign aid and support; and he actually received them. When he was in agony, "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven *strengthening* him." Peter, preaching to Cornelius, said, "Ye know—how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power, (δυναμέι.) This consecrating unction was communicated to him at the time of his baptism. The giving of the Spirit to him without measure endued him with an *ability*, which did not belong to his human nature.

Christ, speaking of his authority, says, "All *power* (ἐξουσία) *is given* unto me in heaven and in earth." Mat. 28:18. "And hath *given* him *authority* to execute judgment also." John 5:27. "As thou hast *given* him *power* (ἐξουσίαν) over all flesh." John 17:2. Other texts of scripture are of similar import. "And there was *given* him dominion and glory and a kingdom." Dan. 7:14. "The Father loveth the Son and hath *given* all things into his hand." John 3:35. "All things are *delivered* to me of my Father." Luke 10:22. "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet." Heb. 2:8. This official authority Christ received from the Father. But the giving of authority does not imply the communication of any new powers. Authority is a liberty to exercise one's powers in a particular way for a particular purpose. When Christ received authority, it did not imply that he received extraordinary qualifications. It rather implied that he possessed the necessary qualifications for his office. When Peter spoke of the anointing of Jesus with the Holy Ghost and with *power*, he spoke of it in connexion with his death and resurrection. It is natural, therefore, to infer that it was the man, Jesus, who was thus anointed. The apostle to the Hebrews, quoting a passage from the forty-fifth Psalm, describes the same unction. "God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows." His fellows were prophets and priests, who were anointed with oil, and with the gifts of the Spirit. It was only in respect to the humanity of Christ, they could be called his fellows; and in this nature he received greater communications of the Holy Spirit than they. But it was not in this nature the angels of God were commanded to worship him. It was not in this nature he inherited a more excellent name than they. It was not in this nature he upheld all things by the word of his power. It appears, therefore, that he had another nature besides that which was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power.

While we find that an angel *strengthened* the humanity of Christ; and that the Spirit communicated to it a supernatural power, and that he received official authority from the Father, we find him possessing a power, which appears to be underived and independent. Christ speaks of a glory he had with the Father before the world was. He does not intimate that *this* glory was given him. In the course of his address to his Father, he says, "The glory, which thou gavest me, I have given them." The glory, which he gave them, was the influence of the Spirit, which enabled them to do extraordinary works. The glory, then, which was given him, was the anointing of the Holy Ghost. But he had a glory

prior to this period; a glory, which was before the world. This could not be the self same glory, which was communicated to him in the flesh. Because glory or power was given to the man Christ Jesus, it does not follow that the Lord from heaven had his glory or power by gift, or by derivation.

Christ, in the continuation of his prayer for his disciples, says, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." From this part of Christ's prayer, it has been inferred that this glory, which was given him was the same, which he had with the Father before the world was. Whether this is true or not, there is no *apparent* connexion between the premises and the conclusion. These glories, which he mentions in the different parts of his prayer belong to two different states, or periods. One belongs to that state, in which he was before he came to this world; the other belongs to that state, in which he is after he has returned to heaven with the trophies of his victory. To infer something immediately from one state respecting the other, is very far from correct reasoning. The scriptures state that he is to *receive* glory in *consequence* of his incarnation and humiliation. The apostle Paul, speaking of him in the form of a servant, and obedient unto death, saith, "*Wherefore* God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow." Again he saith, "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, *crowned with glory and honor.*" From this statement of the apostle it appears, that Christ has a glory since his incarnation, which he had not before; and that he *receives* this glory as a reward for his work of redemption. From this view of the subject it appears that Christ has an essential glory, which he originally had with the Father; and that he has an acquired glory, which was *given* him for establishing a kingdom and bringing it to a state of blessedness.

It is readily admitted that Christ *received power*, from the Holy Spirit, in his human nature; and received *authority*, from the Father, in his mediatorial capacity. This reception of power and authority has given rise to the opinion that Christ is absolutely dependent on, and inferior to, the Father. Whether this opinion is correct or not, it does not conclusively follow from the premises. Because Christ possessed human nature, and received power from heaven in that nature, it does not follow that he does not possess another and a higher nature. The scriptures abundantly testify that the material nature of man is mortal. But it would not be correct to infer that he had no other than a material nature; and that he was wholly mortal. But this inference would be just as conclusive, as the inference that Christ is only human, because the scriptures testify of this humanity. Because the chief Magistrate of a nation commissions certain officers, and authorizes them to do particular duties, it does not follow that their natures are inferior to his. Because Christ is commissioned and authorized by the Father to perform the duties of an office, to which he was appointed, it does not follow, by parity of reasoning, that his nature is inferior to the Father's. Other testimonies beside those, which relate to his humanity and mediatorial office, must be produced to ascertain what was that nature, which he possessed, when he had glory with the Father before the world was, or the nature, which was united with the man Christ Jesus.

Christ, speaking of his coming to raise the dead, says, "They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power (*δυναμει*) and great glory. If this be a work, which belongs to his office, it does not follow that this power was to be *given* to him. As there is no intimation that he received this power from the Father, it is natural to infer that he was to come with his own underived power. When *εξουσια*, *authority* is applied to Christ in the New Testament, it is generally expressed or implied that it was *given* him. When *δυναμις*, *power*, is applied to him, it is neither expressed, nor implied that it was given him, excepting when he was consecrated to the priest's office by the anointing of the Holy Spirit. This unction was evidently imparted to his human nature.

The *manner* of Christ's performing miracles is an evidence that his *power* was not given him. At a wedding in Cana of Galilee he turned water into wine. It is recorded, "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and *shewed forth his glory*. If this miraculous power had been given him by the Father, it is not strictly true that he manifested *his* glory; for it was his Father's glory. When the prophets and apostles wrought miracles, it never was recorded of them that they manifested or shewed forth *their* glory.

When Christ wrought miracles, he appeared to work in his own name and by his own power. His prayer at the grave of Lazarus does not militate against this opinion. He was wont to pray. In his human nature, and in his mediatorial capacity, there was an evident propriety in his making intercession with the Father. Before he raised Lazarus, "Jesus lifted up his eyes and said, Father I thank thee that thou hast heard me; and I know that thou hearest me always; but *because of the people, which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.*" This is a prayer of thanks. It contains no request for favor, or for extraordinary *power* to perform this miracle. He gave thanks to the Father that he had heard him. It is natural to suppose that he gave thanks for what he had said he was glad, or rejoiced, in the former part of the chapter. When Jesus heard of the sickness of his friend, he said, this sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God; *that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.* This was the *intent* of his sickness. Instead of going directly to visit and heal his sick friend, "he abode two days still in the same place where he was." When he knew that he was dead, he stated the fact to his disciples; and he added, "*I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe.*" It was for the opportunity of glorifying himself and of producing conviction in his disciples that he was the Son of God; that he had life in himself and quickened whom he would, that he was glad. It appears that it was for this opportunity he prayed; that it was for the hearing of this prayer; for the occurrence of this opportunity he gave thanks at the grave of Lazarus. This was the cause of his gratitude. But he *said* it, i. e. he gave thanks *because* of the people that stood by, that they might believe that the Father had sent him. By this act of prayer and the acceptance of it, he manifested the union of will and operation, which subsisted between him and the Father. But there is not the least intimation, nor evidence that he asked for *power*. When the prophets and apostles wrought miracles, they gave decisive evidence that the power was not of themselves, but of God.

"As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he *given* to the Son to have life in himself," John 5:26. From this passage it is inferred by some that the Father gave *power* to the Son to raise the dead. The inference is not conclusive; and the sentiment appears to be unfounded. The life, which the Father had in himself was an eternal independent life; or it was the power of communicating life in any period of eternity. Either is a divine attribute and cannot be communicated to a creature. But this is not the intent of the text. The import of it appears to be this. As the Father hath power in himself of giving life, so he hath given *authority* to the Son, to exercise the same power, which he has in himself. That the gift, which the Father made to the Son was *authority*, not *power*, is evident from the following verse. "And hath *given* him *authority* to execute judgment also. It appears that the same qualification, which was necessary for executing judgment, was also necessary for raising the dead. As the qualification requisite for doing the former was *authority*, it is inferred that the same qualification was necessary for doing the latter. When Christ had received this *authority*, it was then true, "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, *even so* the Son quickeneth whom he will."

Jesus Christ calls himself *the* Life; the resurrection and the life. St. John says, "In him was life; and the Life was the light of men. The life was manifested and we have seen it; and bear witness and shew unto you that *eternal Life, which was with the Father*, and was manifested unto us." If Christ had not life in himself, and had not power in himself to communicate it, there appears to be no propriety, no pertinence in calling him *the Life*. St. John calls this Life, *eternal Life*, which was with the Father. By this name he meant Christ; for, said he, "we have seen it; and it was manifested unto us." If he was with the Father, and was eternal, he had the same *power* to communicate life, which the Father had.

Jesus Christ had authority to forgive sins. This work belongs to his mediatorial office; and, of course, his authority to do it was *given* him. He exercised this authority when he was upon earth. At a certain time "They brought to him a man, sick of the palsy, lying on a bed; and Jesus, seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee. And behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, this man blasphemeth. And Jesus knowing their thoughts, said, wherefore think ye evil in your hearts; for whether is it easier to say, thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, arise and

walk. But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power (ἐξουσίαν authority) on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy) arise, take up thy bed, and go into thine house." From this account, it is inferred by some that the forgiving of the sins of the paralytic man was nothing more than the removing of his disorder; and that the *power* Christ exercised on this occasion, did not belong to his nature; but it was given him. In answer to this, let it be observed, that the cures, which Christ wrought upon invalids, appear to have been *generally* accompanied, or followed by a spiritual cure upon the subject. Admitting this to be fact, it would be *generally* of the same import, whether Christ said to an impotent person, thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, arise and walk. Besides, Christ sometimes declared forgiveness of sins, when no bodily disease existed in the object; at least, when no bodily disease was named. A certain woman, who was a sinner, went to Christ; washed his feet with tears; and wiped them with her hair. She kissed his feet and anointed them. Christ said unto her, "Thy sins are forgiven.—Thy faith hath saved thee." This is not a solitary case of forgiveness for sin through faith in Christ. Pardon of sin through faith in the Lord Jesus is a prominent doctrine of the New Testament. When Jesus met Saul of Tarsus on his journey to Damascus, he commissioned him to be a minister to the Gentiles, "that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them, which are sanctified by *faith* that is in *me*." It would seem strange that faith in Christ should be a condition of forgiveness, if he had not power *in himself* to forgive. It is the office of Christ to pronounce sentence upon the human race in the day of judgment; as it is his prerogative to give reward to the righteous, it appears rational that he should forgive their sins. There is no intimation given that he depends on foreign power for assistance in performing the duties of this high and important office. When he forgave sins here upon earth, he spoke not the language of dependence. When he awards retribution to the human race at the great last day, he is represented a King, speaking the language, not of borrowed power, but the language of divine sovereignty.

DIVINE HONORS ASCRIBED TO JESUS CHRIST.

"That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father," John 5:23. Christ has performed and will perform works, which require almighty power. Divine titles, even the highest, are given to him. He possesses divine attributes. He exercises divine authority. These things are revealed. These are articles of belief. These produce a practical effect. These demand divine honors. The sacred scriptures ascribe the same kind of honor to the Son, which they ascribe to the Father, i. e. divine honor. It is of importance to form correct ideas of all the doctrines of the scriptures. But it is peculiarly important to form correct ideas of those doctrines, which directly affect the practice. It is of the first importance to render supreme honor to whom it is due, and to avoid idolatry.

The sacred scriptures are a safe and sure guide on this subject. They ascribe divine honors to the Son, in connexion with the Father. Christ's commission to his apostles, when he sent them to evangelize the world was, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Whether this text signifies that the apostles, in administering the ordinance of baptism, acted in the name, and under the authority, of the sacred Three; or whether it signifies that by this rite they initiated persons into Christianity; and united them to Christ's visible kingdom, it has the same bear-

ing upon the subject under consideration. In either case, it connects the Son with the Father, and gives to each the same authority and honor. If it is divine honor to the Father to have control over ministering servants, and to have persons formally introduced into his kingdom, the same acts give the same honor to Christ.

The Son of God, speaking of his power and authority to raise the dead, and judge the world, draws this conclusion, "they should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." As these works require divine perfections, it is a just and natural inference that they should give him divine honor.

Paul in his salutations to the churches, repeatedly says, "Grace to you and peace from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." If divine honor is due to the Father for giving grace and peace to the world, the same honor is due to Christ; for they come from him no less than from the Father. God has given to Christ a name, "which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." To bow the knee to Jesus, signifies to worship him. That the knee of every thing in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, should bow to him, implies the universality of his worship. To confess Jesus Christ to be Lord, is to acknowledge his sovereignty; and this acknowledgment will be to the glory of God the Father. This acknowledgment would not be to his glory, if his Son were not divine. But a confession of his Son's divinity, implies the divinity of the Father. In the book of the Revelation of St. John, it is written, "And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him, that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. I

beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." In one of these texts, all creatures are brought to view, giving divine honors to him that sat upon the throne; and giving equal honors to the Lamb. In another of these texts an innumerable multitude of saints, ascribed the same glory to Christ, which they ascribed to the Father. Divine honor, or worship, was given to Christ, without naming the Father. By the Psalmist it was predicted of Christ, "blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord." This ascription of honor was actually made to him by the multitude, who went before and followed him, when he was riding up to Jerusalem.

When it was known abroad that Jesus was born, wise men came from the East to do him honor. Their *design* of going, was to worship him, See Matt. 2:2. When they saw him, they fell down and *worshipped* him. At a time when Christ was on his way to Jerusalem, "The whole multitude of his disciples began to rejoice and praise *God* with a loud voice, saying, blessed be the *King*, that cometh in the name of the Lord, peace in heaven, and glory in the highest." Their praising God consisted in giving blessing to the King, i. e. Christ; and they gave him glory in the highest. When the Pharisees called upon him to rebuke his disciples for giving him this divine homage, he replied, "If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out." Christ could not have expressed his approbation of their homage, nor his claim to divine honor, in stronger language. One of the malefactors, who was crucified with Jesus, addressed him by prayer, "Lord, remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom." Christ approved and answered his petition. When Christ was about to

leave the world and ascend to the Father, he blessed his disciples. "And it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven. *And they worshipped him.*"

When Stephen was stoned he offered up a petition, "saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." This was a prayer addressed to Christ; and it was addressed to him, when he saw him on the right hand of God. He continued his petition to his Lord and said, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge."

The primitive Christians called upon the name of Christ; which was an act of prayer or worship. When the Lord commanded Ananias to go and heal Saul of his blindness, he replied, "I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all, that *call on thy name.*" When Paul began to preach, his hearers inquired, saying, "Is not this he that destroyed them, which *called on this name* in Jerusalem?" "Be baptized and wash away thy sins, *calling upon the name of the Lord.* The same Lord is rich unto all that *call upon him.*" Whosoever shall *call upon the name of the Lord* shall be saved. When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God *worship* him. St. John heard many of the inhabitants of heaven, "saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."

The pagans reproached the primitive Christians for giving divine honors to Christ. "Pliny, a Roman proconsul celebrated for his works, giving an account to the emperior Trajan of their morals and doctrine, after being forced to confess that the Christians were pious, innocent and upright men, and that they assembled before the rising of the sun, not to concert the commission of crimes, or to disturb the peace of the empire, but to live in piety and righteousness, to detest frauds, adulteries, and even the coveting of wealth of

others; he only reproaches them with chanting hymns in honor of their Christ, and of rendering to him the same homages as to a god."

It clearly appears from the sacred scriptures and from history that divine honors were given to Christ. There is no evidence that he ever discountenanced the practice. There is evidence that he approved it. When the early Christians were accused of giving divine worship to Christ they did not deny the charge; but they gave evidence that they esteemed and reverenced him as God.

The character, which the sacred scriptures give to the Son of God entitles him to divine honors. By inheritance he possesses a more excellent name than the angels. The work of creation, the performance of miracles in his own name, the government of all things are attributed to him. He has power to raise the dead, to judge the world, and distribute reward and punishment. Divine perfections are attributed to him; and he manifested the holiness of divine nature. As great works, as great authority, as exalted titles, as much love and excellence, are attributed to the Son as to the Father. If the Father is entitled to love, obedience, and worship, on account of the excellence of his nature, and the communications of his goodness, Christ is entitled to equal love, obedience and worship. It is not an arbitrary act of divine power to require people to honor the Son even as they honor the Father; for Christ, in his own nature and communications, demands this homage.

It cannot justly be denied that the sacred scriptures require divine honors to be paid to the Son of God. It cannot be denied that primitive Christians, and Christians in every age, have esteemed and worshipped Christ as God. This esteem and reverence for the Lord Jesus was derived directly from the character which he exhibited, and from the system of religion which he published, and his apostles propagated. The Christian religion was designed to be, and it has been

published, among Jews and Gentiles. One great object of Christianity was to turn them from idolatry to the worship, the spiritual worship, of the only living and true God. When it is considered how prone mankind were to idolatry, it might be expected that the greatest care would be taken to avoid any intimation, which would give the least encouragement to idolatry. If Christ be a mere creature; if he be not entitled to divine worship, precaution was not used in the sacred writings against idolatry. On the contrary, they laid its foundation, and gave it an extensive and perpetual patronage. Christ claimed union with the Father in design and operation. He thought it not robbery to be equal with God. He inculcated the duty of honoring the Son even as they honored the Father. He allowed his disciples to call him God. He allowed them to worship him, and he forbade them not. His church has, in every age, acknowledged him to be God, and have worshipped him as God. If this is error, if this is idolatry, Christ is the author of it; the inspired writings support it.

It is true, the sacred scriptures, in certain instances give great limitations to Jesus Christ. He acknowledges that the Father is greater than he; that he is sent by the Father. As Jesus Christ was both human and divine, it is highly probable that he would sometimes speak of one nature, sometimes of the other. When he spoke of his human nature, he would of course speak of it with limitations. If it be just to infer from that class of texts, which attribute limited properties to Christ, that he possesses only human nature, it is equally just to infer from that class of texts, which attribute divine works, names, attributes, and worship to him, that he possesses only divine nature. But this is not a correct method of reasoning. Instead of attempting to make one part of scripture destroy another, care ought to be taken to compare part with part; discover their connexion and object; and if possible discover their coincidence. If it be previously determined that the

divinity of Christ shall not stand, every thing is made to bear against it. The plainest texts are tortured till they unwillingly speak the language of those who use them. If it be admitted that human and divine nature are united in Christ, it is easy to account for those divine ascriptions, which are made to him, while he speaks of himself possessing limited qualities.

The sacred scriptures attribute to the Son divine names, divine attributes, divine offices, divine works, and divine worship. If Christ possessed divine nature, he was *entitled* to divine honors. If he did not possess divine nature, his works, his titles, his offices could not claim those honors, which are due to the Father. Moses, the other prophets, and the apostles, performed works which required divine power; and they filled high and important offices. Why was not Moses entitled to divine honor for bringing miraculous plagues on the land of Egypt? Why was not Joshua entitled to divine honor for staying the sun and moon in their courses? Why were not the prophets and apostles entitled to divine honor for healing diseases and raising the dead? Because they did not perform these works by their own power. It was the power of God operating through them, which performed these extraordinary works. This they acknowledged. They disclaimed superior excellence. They disclaimed all title to divine honor. Moses was buried in a secret place to prevent the idolatry of the people at his grave. The apostles used the greatest care to ascribe all efficiency in their extraordinary works to God; and to prevent people from giving them divine worship. As well might human qualities be attributed to the instruments we use, as divine qualities be attributed to men for works, which God performed through them.

If Christ performed his works by his own natural power; if his names were significant of his nature; if he possessed those attributes, which are ascribed to him in the scriptures; if he was competent in his own nature to fill those offices, which he sustained, he had

a *claim* to divine honors. But if he was only *constituted* Creator; if he was only the medium through which the Father created the world; if divine names and attributes were attributed to him merely because he acted *by* the influence of the Father, and was *appointed*, *constituted*, *ordained* to the highest offices, he is no more entitled to divine honors than were the prophets and apostles. It is admitted that people are entitled to honor proportionate to their offices, if they be adequate to the duties of their respective stations. But an elevated office does no honor to a man, unless he does honor to the office. Should our government appoint a minister to a foreign court, who did not possess one qualification for that office, and needed and received mediately or immediately the instructions of the chief magistrate in every step of his proceedings, is such a man entitled to ministerial honor? Ought the foreign court to honor him even as they honored the chief magistrate? By giving him presidential honors, would they honor the chief magistrate of our country? If Christ derived all his qualifications for his offices from the Father, the honor of all his official transactions would be due to the Father, not to him. If he were honored according to his offices, the Father, who established them by his own authority, and filled them with his own fulness would be entitled to greater honor. It would be disproportionate to honor the Son even as they honor the Father. It is not doubted that it is an honor to a chief magistrate to honor his ministers; but it would not be an honor to him to transfer to them the honor, which was due only to himself.

If the Son be inferior in nature to the Father, it is impossible to honor the Father by giving divine honors to the Son. It is in vain to say that those divine honors, which are given to the Son are given ultimately to the Father; that he is the constituted medium, through which God the Father is worshipped; and that he does not receive divine honors for

any excellence of his *own* nature, nor for any acts of his *own* power. The pagans have ever cherished a sentiment similar to this and they have worshipped accordingly. They appeared to suppose that God was a holy Being and that they had offended him. They, therefore, sought some medium, through which they might pay him their homage and render him propitious. When the heathen worshipped the sun, they did not design that their religious homage should terminate in that luminous body. But they designed to worship it as the most striking image of the Deity; or as the medium, through which he bestowed his greatest blessings. When they worshipped the elements or any of the brutal creation, they imagined that the Deity either resided in them; or that through them he would operate in their favor. When they worshipped departed spirits, they imagined that they would intercede with God for them; and through their influence they should receive divine favors. In all this kind of worship they probably designed to extend their homage ultimately to the Deity; unless it were in some instances, in which they had lived so long in idolatry, and had become so gross in their worship, that they lost sight of the Deity in their similitudes.

God's first command to Israel was to prevent them from having more than one God, and his second was to restrain them from idolatry. If Christ possess not divine nature, if he be only a subordinate Deity, it appears to be no less idolatry to worship him than it is to worship the sun, moon, the host of heaven, the elements, individuals of the brutal creation, or departed spirits.

Another argument, of no inconsiderable weight in favor of Christ's claim to divine honors, may be drawn from his own words at the institution and celebration of the ordinance of the supper. *This do in remembrance of me*, Luke 22:19. The design of the Lord's Supper was to keep in remembrance the Lord Jesus

Christ. When we attend the celebration of this ordinance, we are naturally carried back to him, who instituted it; and to the purposes he intended to accomplish by its observance. We find that it was Christ himself, who instituted this rite; and that he intended this as a mean of keeping in remembrance himself, his sufferings, and the blessings which are conferred in consequence of them. In the ordinance we behold the figure of the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world; the figure of the sacrifice, which was offered upon the cross; the figure of that blood, without the shedding of which there can be no remission. We fix our attention upon Jesus Christ, the Author and Finisher of faith; the Author of eternal salvation. This ordinance, then, not only serves to keep the Savior in remembrance, but it tends to excite in the heart love and gratitude to the Author of these inestimable blessings. It was enjoined by the Savior that this ordinance should be perpetuated in the Church till his second coming, the end of the world. He specified the object of this duty. He required that it should be done in remembrance of *himself.*

The apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians respecting their irregular attendance upon this ordinance, attaches the highest importance to a right performance of this duty; and distinguished guilt to a violation of it. His language on this subject is strong and plain. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." There is no sin, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit excepted, for which greater punishment is threatened, or against which it is made more sure, than a profanation of the Lord's supper. There is no duty, which appears more solemn or interesting than this. It is solemn, because it brings to view the crucifixion of the Lord of glory; and because he grants his special presence on the

occasion. It is interesting, because without the sacrifice, which is represented by this ordinance, there can be no remission of sin. Christ himself hath said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, there is no life in you." "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." Let it be remarked, and let it be remembered, that Christ established this positive institution, and that he made *himself the object of this duty*, "This do in remembrance of *me*."

It is generally, if not universally, admitted, that a celebration of the Lord's supper is a *religious* service. It is required in the same scriptures, and by the same authority, by which every duty is required. After the work of creation was completed, God set apart the seventh day, that his rational creatures might commemorate this important event, and observe it as a day of holy rest. This was undoubtedly a religious service, and directed to the Creator. When a more important event, the *redemption* of the world, took place, then the day on which it occurred, the day of the resurrection, was appointed for the commemoration of the work of redemption, and for divine service. The Lord's supper is an institution of divine appointment, no less than the Sabbath, or public worship.

When the members of a church attend rightly upon this ordinance, they bring to view what the Savior has done for them. They consider him the procuring cause of salvation. They look over the favors they have received, and those which are offered them; and they find none greater than the provision made and offered by Christ for their salvation. Was it a favor that they received natural life and support from the divine hand; it is no less a favor that they were redeemed from the second death, and enjoy spiritual support. Look over the whole catalogue of blessings which have come upon this world, and there are none greater than those conferred by Christ, and recognized in this ordinance. In attending upon this

rite the attention is fixed on Christ, on the benefits he has communicated, and those, which he offers. Love and gratitude are excited toward their Benefactor; and in the spirit of obedience, they do it in remembrance of *Him.* Here is a religious service, as solemn as devotional, as interesting as any which is required at their hands, and it is offered to Christ. It is done in remembrance of *Him.* It is done to the honor of his name; and a greater honor they do not give in any religious service whatever. Do we honor God by sanctifying the Sabbath, by waiting upon him in his court? We honor Christ no less by professing his name, and commemorating his death, his love, and his blessings.

Pagans had long given divine honors to distinguished men. Those, who were renowned in arms, or had done extraordinary things for their nation, were, after their decease, enrolled among the gods, and made the objects of honors, which were not due to created beings. This practice was displeasing in the divine sight. One object of Christ's coming into the world, was to expose the error of idolatry, and to establish the worship of the only living and true God. He knew the proneness of the human heart at that day, to have lords many, and gods many. He knew their eager disposition to catch at every thing, which would encourage them in the deification of departed men of uncommon character, and in the practice of idolatry. With these circumstances in view, suppose Christ was simply a created being, of pure intentions, and designing to establish a religion, which would give all glory to God alone, can it be supposed he would establish a religious rite for the purpose of exalting himself in the affections of mankind; of keeping himself in everlasting remembrance in the church; and denouncing the heaviest punishment, even condemnation upon those, who should not suitably observe his decree, and do honor to his name? Had he adopted this method, what more could his friends have desired to justify

themselves in placing his name among the gods, and of rendering him divine honors? The church generally, ever since the institution of this ordinance, have given divine honors to Christ in its celebration, and if they have, in this respect, fallen into idolatry, it appears that they have been led into this error, by the nature and design of this rite, and by the time and manner of its institution. It is strange indeed, if this holy ordinance, which was designed to be the central, the rallying point, of the church of God, should be the occasion of drawing it principally into idolatry. It is readily admitted, that the holiest things are perverted by the wicked to their destruction. But to suppose as intelligent and as pious part of the world as exists should generally, from the first institution of this ordinance, have given themselves up to idolatry, is a hypothesis too big with absurdity to be believed by those, who would solve every difficulty in our religion by the efforts of reason.

We are aware of the objection made against this sentiment; that the religious service, which is offered to Christ, is given ultimately to the Father; that the Son is an ambassador; that he is respected as such, but all the honor terminates in God. But this opinion appears very different from the language, which Christ used in the institution of the ordinance; "This do in remembrance of *me*." If he was only an ambassador, or an inferior agent, this language appears to be entirely inappropriate. It appears that it would be offensive to God. When Moses, at the rock, made an assumption of power, which detracted from the authority of the King of Israel, he felt his sore displeasure, and suffered for his rashness. Shall we offer religious service to Moses, because he was God's messenger to deliver the Hebrews from the land of bondage? Shall we offer religious service to the prophets and apostles, because they were messengers of God for the good of the world, and say, this religious honor terminates in him, who sent them? So

reason the heathen and the papists, when they bow down before beasts and images. But with the light of revelation in our eye, and the second command in our hand, is it possible that we can fall into this gross absurdity? Were there danger that we should love Christ too much, or that we should give him too much honor, would this ordinance have been instituted, which is calculated to excite the devoutest affections of our hearts toward our Redeemer, unless a caution were given to prevent us from holding him in too high estimation; and of rendering him too much of our service. Let us illustrate the case by an example: Suppose a king, whose subjects had been guilty of treason, and had exposed themselves to capital punishment, should select one of his people, who had not fallen into the common transgression, or one from another nation, to be an ambassador to treat with them on the terms of reconciliation between them and their sovereign. After every thing is done on his part to effect his benevolent purpose, the ambassador appoints a certain celebration to be observed from generation to generation, to keep *himself* in remembrance, for the services he had rendered them. Would he, by this method, give suitable honor to his king, and would not the subjects overlook the sovereign in the more pleasing and interesting view of his agent? Or, suppose the man, who was most prominent in the deliverance of our country from foreign oppression, should, at the declaration of independence, have appointed a day of festivity to be observed for ever, *to keep himself in their remembrance*, who would not perceive the incongruity? Who would not shudder at the thought that a sight of God should be lost in a view of the man?

When we argue that the honor attached to this ordinance should be given to the Son, we would not be misunderstood. We hold that the Father and Holy Spirit, participate with him the glory of man's redemption.

When we look upon this ordinance, observe its nature, design, and manner of its institution; when we consider the blessings, which are involved in this representation, and the magnitude of the sin of profaning this rite; when we consider, that no duty is more solemn, or momentous than this; that it is required of every believer; that it is a religious service of the highest grade, and that it is offered to Christ; who can withhold the conclusion, that we should honor the Son, *even as* we honor the Father?*

* It is readily admitted that the word worship, the act of kneeling and of falling on the face to the ground, do not designate the *degree* of respect, which is offered to an object. But as these acts were often used to tender homage to God, it might reasonably be expected that Jesus, if he had been merely a creature, would have cautioned his worshippers lest they should offer him the highest degree of respect. When the people of Lystra would have sacrificed to Paul and Barnabas, they suffered them not; and told them plainly that they were men of like passions with themselves. When Cornelius fell down at Peter's feet and worshipped, "Peter took him up, saying, stand up, I myself also am a man." When St. John fell down to worship at the feet of the angel, who had shewed him many things, the angel said, "see thou do it not." But Christ laid no prohibition upon those who offered him similar expressions of respect. The inference is plain, that there was no danger of their offering him too high a degree of homage.

"That all men should honor the Son, *even as* they honor the Father," John 5:23. It has been attempted to weaken this testimony by improving the translation in this manner; "that all men should honor the Son, *because* they honor the Father." (See Yates' Vindication of Unitarianism.) This appears to be not only a wrong translation of the particle, καθως, but a perversion of the design of the text. The text is the effect, or consequence of the preceding verse. The Father—hath committed all judgment unto the Son, ἱνα, *to the end that*, "all men should honor the Son." "Though Ἱνα *commonly* denotes *the end, for which a thing is done*, it often signifies the *effect*, or consequence of an action simply, without expressing the intention of the agent. Ἱνα sometimes denotes the efficient cause." (Macknight. See Schleus. Lex. on the word.) The end, or consequence of committing all judgment unto the Son is, therefore, that all men should honor him. But according to the proposed translation, the former part of the verse is the consequence of the latter part; the honoring of the Son, is to be the effect, or consequence of honoring the Father. By this construction the force of the particle, ἱνα, which connects this with the preceding verse, is entirely destroyed.

Καθως, which stands for *even as*, in our translation, is compounded of κατα & ως. Ως is often used to denote comparison. "Ως is sometimes used affirmatively, and must be translated indeed, truly, certainly, actually. Κατα increases the meaning of the word, with which it is compounded." (Macknight.) According to these principles, the particle, καθως, is used to compare the honoring of the Son with the honoring of the Father. The same force, or degree of meaning, which this particle has in relation to the honoring of the Father, the same it has in relation to the honoring of the Son. See the force of Καθως in Mat. 21:6. 26:24. Mark 9:13, and 15:18.

We are not left to the natural explication of particles, and to the homage which Christ received on earth from his disciples, to prove that he is entitled to divine honors, and that he is a proper object of supplication. The scriptures testify that he was invoked; that he was addressed by prayer after he left the world. In addition to the texts, which have been cited already for this purpose, there are others of similar import, which may be adduced, and on which, and on those, which have been already quoted, we would make some critical remarks. Paul, in the beginning of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, says, "Unto the church of God,

which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all, that in every place *call upon* the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord." This phraseology naturally leads to the conclusion that Christians, in the apostles' time, addressed prayers to Jesus Christ. But this conclusion is evaded by an *improved version* of this, and parallel texts. They are translated passively; viz. *called by, or after the name of the Lord.* (See the Improved Version of the N. T.; Yates' Vindication of Unitarianism; Lindsey's Second Address, &c.) To make this translation consist with grammatical principles, it is conceived that the dative, not the accusative case, ought to have been used after the participle. This observation is sanctioned by the authority of the LXX. See Isaiah 43:7. But if this evidence be not sufficient to settle the meaning of the word, its common use by the writers of the New Testament, and by the Septuagint *ought* to determine whether it is to be taken passively or actively. When the inspired writers and the seventy would convey the idea that any person or thing was called by the name of the Lord, they uniformly used, as far as I have examined, a *different* phraseology. A translation, which violates the idiom of the original, and is contrary to the *usual* meaning of words and phrases does not become *critical* inquirers after truth.

"For this thing I *besought* the Lord thrice. And he said unto me, my grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength (δυναμις) is made perfect in weakness; most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power (δυναμις) of Christ may rest upon me," 2 Cor. 12:8, 9. The latter part of this passage plainly shews that the Lord, whom Paul besought thrice, was Christ. Here we have a prayer offered to him without any objection arising from the passive form of the verb; and it might reasonably be expected without *any* objections arising from the phraseology, or from the circumstances. But in opposition to this expectation, and to the natural tenor of the passage, as it is admitted by the most candid Unitarians, it is stated that, "St. Paul appears here to have directed his prayer to God, the Father. N. B. The apostles were not so exact in the use of the words, Lord, Savior and the like, which they indifferently gave both to God and to Christ, never supposing that any would mistake their Lord and Master, so lately born and living amongst men, to be the supreme God and object of worship." (Lindsey's Apology, p. 147.) It is of no use to argue with men on this subject, who accuse the apostles with a disregard to *exactness* in the application of the names, "Lord, Savior and the like." It is of no use to reason with them upon the doctrines of the Bible, till they are established in the belief of its divine authority; that it was written with *exactness.*

But when it is admitted that Christ was the object of the apostle's invocation, who can object to offering him prayer? But it is thought "probable, that, when Paul besought him, he was present with the Apostle either in vision, or personally." (*Yates.*) From this supposition it is inferred that it is not proper to address prayer to Christ, unless he be, in some manner, visible. If visibility be a necessary qualification in Christ to be an object of supplication, why is so much labor spent to shew that he did not receive it, and was not entitled to it, when he was *visibly* present on earth? If visibility be a necessary qualification in a being in order to receive divine worship, then God the Father, is destitute of a necessary qualification.

"And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit; and he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord lay not this sin to their charge," Acts 7:59, 60. If ever a man was qualified to make an appropriate prayer, and to direct it to a proper object, it seems that Stephen was qualified. *He was full of the Holy Ghost.* He was just going to enter the world of spirits. He saw, either ocularly, or mentally, the Son of man on the right hand of God; of course he saw both. In this plenitude of inspiration, in this most solemn and interesting situation, in view of death, of heaven, and of the glory of God, he breathed out his soul in prayer to that Savior, in whose service he had lived; for whose cause he was about to die; and who was *able* to save his soul. It is in vain to urge the peculiar circumstances of Stephen as the principal *ground* of his petition to Christ. The circumstances of the supplicant make no alteration in the being supplicated. The circumstance of Christ's being seen or unseen makes no alteration in his will or power to hear. He, who knew what was in man, when he was upon earth, is not limited in knowledge now he is in heaven. When he was upon the cross he granted the humble request of a penitent. Now he is upon a *throne*, he is not less entitled to prayer; nor is he less able to grant requests. It must be, at all times, proper to call upon him, because he is *always* able to save to the uttermost.

CHRIST'S RAISING THE DEAD, AND JUDGING THE WORLD, ARE EVIDENCES OF HIS DIVINITY.

"He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man, whom he hath ordained," Acts 17:31. In every part of Christ's character; in every office which he sustains; and in every work, which he performs, there is evidence of his divinity. The sacred scriptures afford abundant proof that he will raise the dead. Christ declared his power to raise himself from the dead. Speaking of laying down his life, he said, "*I* have power to lay it down; and *I* have power to take it again," John 10:18. "Destroy this temple and in three days *I* will raise it up." He spake of the temple of his body. It is no more incredible that Christ should raise his own body, than he should raise any other human body. The same power, which could raise one, could raise the other. The resurrection of the body of Christ is attributed to God. The apostle Peter in his sermon to a mixed multitude on the day of Pentecost, preached Christ. Among other things he said, "This Jesus hath God raised up. Ye killed the Prince of life, whom *God* hath raised from the dead. Him *God* raised up the third day, and shewed him openly." The apostle Paul to the Romans makes this article of belief essential to salvation. "If thou shalt believe in thine heart that *God* hath raised him (i. e. Christ) from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Again he says, "*God* hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his

own power." Many other passages in the sacred scriptures assert that *God* raised up Christ. If the self-same work, the resurrection of the body of Jesus, is attributed in the same unqualified manner, both to Christ and to God, it follows that Christ is God. Upon this ground there is no impropriety in saying that Christ raised himself, and that *God* raised him from the dead.

The scriptures furnish abundant evidence that Christ will raise the dead. Christ himself asserts, "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Jesus said of himself, "I am the resurrection and the life." The apostle Paul, contrasting Christ with Adam, says, "For since by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead." To the Thessalonians he writes thus, "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first." The general resurrection is no less attributed in the scriptures to *God*. The apostle Paul, in his plea before Agrippa, inquires, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that *God* should raise the dead?" To the Corinthians he declares the same sentiment, "*God* hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power." As the scriptures attribute the resurrection to Christ as absolutely as to God, it is natural to infer that Christ is God; that there is such an inseparable union between him and God the Father, that the same work may, with propriety, be attributed to each.

The resurrection of Christ's body is attributed to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit. The apostle Paul, in his salutation, attributes it to the Father. "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." Christ, upon the subject of his own resurrection, says, "Destroy this temple, and in three days *I* will raise it up. I have power to lay it

(i. e. his life,) down and I have power to take it again." The same work is attributed to the Holy Spirit. "Christ also hath once suffered for sin;—being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the *Spirit.*"—"As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, *even so* the Son quickeneth whom *he will.* Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus." The two last passages, and many others attribute the resurrection indiscriminately to the Father or the Son. As the work of creation is sometimes attributed to God, sometimes to the Father, to the Son, to the Spirit, in like manner is the resurrection attributed to them. The observations of the learned Macknight on this subject, in a note on 1 Peter 3:18, are important. "As Christ was conceived in the womb of his mother, by the Holy Spirit; Luke 1:35, so he was raised from the dead by the same Spirit; on which account he is said, 1 Tim. 3:16, to have been *justified by the Spirit;* and Heb. 9:14, to have offered himself without fault to God *through the eternal Spirit.* It is true the resurrection of Christ, is ascribed to the Father, 1 Cor. 6:14. 2 Cor. 4:14. Ephes. 1:20. But that is not inconsistent with Peter's affirmation in this verse. For the Father may, with the strictest propriety, be said to have done what the Spirit did by his appointment; especially as it was done to shew that God acknowledged Jesus to be his Son: What our Lord said concerning his own resurrection, John 2:19, *Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up,* is to be understood in the same manner. For having told the Jews, John 10:18, *I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again,* he added, *this commandment I received of my Father.* Christ's resurrection being an example as well as a proof of our resurrection, he was raised by the agency of the Spirit, perhaps, to shew that we shall be raised by the same power, exerted agreeably to the will of God and of Christ; on which account the resurrection of the dead is ascribed sometimes to the Father, Acts 26:8. 1 Cor.

6:14. Heb. 11:19; but more frequently to the Son, John 5:28. 6:39, 40. 1 Cor. 15:21, &c. 1 Thess. 6:16, &c. As the resurrection is attributed indiscriminately to the Father and the Son, it appears there is a union between them, which does not subsist between two distinct natures. As the Son acts in subordination to, and by the appointment of, the Father, what he does may, with propriety, be attributed to the Father. As the Spirit acts in subordination to, and by the appointment of, the Son, what he does may, with propriety, be attributed to the Son. As there is a union of nature subsisting between the Father, the Son and the Spirit; as the two latter act in offices subordinate to that of the former, the same work may be attributed to each individually, or to them all collectively. Upon this ground, the resurrection of Christ's body, and the general resurrection, may be attributed to the Father, to the Son, to the Holy Spirit, or to God, without these distinctions.

It is impossible to determine how great are the powers of the highest created intelligence, or what he could, or could not do by his native strength. But there are certain works recorded in the Scriptures, which were effected by divine power. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." It appears that it would require no less power, knowledge and wisdom to reorganize and reanimate a human body reduced to dust, than it required originally to form one of dust. He, who will raise the dead, must have knowledge of all the human bodies deceased from the beginning to the end of the world. He must discriminate between that matter, which composed those bodies and other matter. He must know whether that matter, which was united with the soul at the time of separation, or whether the matter, which was united with it at some other period, or whether all the matter, which had

ever been attached to it, is to be raised. At different ages the body is composed of different matter. It sometimes occurs that, in consequence of amputation, different parts of the body are laid in places far remote from each other. Many human bodies have been consumed by beasts of prey and by fishes of the sea; and have made additions to their bodies. Some of the human race have been devoured by their fellow creatures; and one human body has become incorporated with another. What eye can bring into one view all the disorganized human matter which from the first to the last age of the world, lies scattered through the earth? What eye can distinguish between human dust and common dust? What eye can distinguish between human matter and those animal bodies, which have been nourished by it; or can distinguish between human bodies, which have been blended by cannibals? What power can, with one call, collect from the four winds all the slumbering dust of the whole human family? What wisdom can reorganize the inanimate bodies of the human race; and give to each its former proportion, features and likeness; and unite with each its own spirit? What power, knowledge, and wisdom, are competent to the performance of this work? This appears to be as great as the works of God; and it appears that divinity only is equal to its accomplishment.

Christ will not only reorganize human bodies, but he will effect a certain change upon them. The bodies of the righteous, whether in the grave, or alive upon the earth, will be made incorruptible and spiritual. "We look (says St. Paul) for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." It is probable that the bodies of the wicked will undergo a change by the resurrection, not less than that of the righteous; that they will appear as much more inglorious, as the righteous will appear more glorious than they did in this world. The prophet Daniel observes,

"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to *shame* and everlasting *contempt*." This relates primarily to Israel; but it undoubtedly alludes to the resurrection at the end of the world. He alone, who formed the natural body, can make it a spiritual and glorious body; or change it for its *shame and everlasting contempt*.

After Christ has raised the dead he will judge the world. The Scriptures abundantly testify that Christ will be Judge at the last day. "The Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him; and then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them, one from another, as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. The Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; and hath given him authority to execute judgment because he is the Son of man." When Peter preached Christ to Cornelius and to those, who were with him, he said, "He commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he, which was ordained of God to be *Judge* of quick and dead. We shall all stand before the *judgment seat of Christ*." The apostle Paul charged Peter "before the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *judge* the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom."

The judgment of the world is also attributed to God. "He, (i. e. Jehovah) shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." The judgment of God is according to truth. I saw the dead small and great stand before God, and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things, which were written in the books, according to their works. He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man (ἐν ἀνδρὶ) whom he hath ordained, Acts 17:31.

In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, (δια ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.) In that passage, in which it is said God will judge the world *by that man*, the word in the original, translated *by*, frequently signifies *in*. Admitting this translation to be correct, the text will stand thus, "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness *in* that man, whom he hath ordained." This is parallel with another passage of scripture, which says, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." The original words in both texts are the same. In the other passage, in which it is said, "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men *by* Jesus Christ." The original word rendered *by*, (with a genitive) is connected sometimes with the efficient cause; and sometimes it signifies *in*.* Admitting these constructions, and it follows that Christ was God, or that God was *in* Christ. When it is asserted that the Father judgeth not; but that God judgeth and Christ judgeth, it is a fair inference, that Christ is the God who judgeth.

Christ will pronounce sentence upon the human race, and he will distribute reward and punishment. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works," Matt. 16:27. To them on his right hand he will say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," Mat. 25:34. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father," Mat. 13:43.

Christ will inflict punishment on the wicked. "Then shall he say to them on the left hand, Depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. These shall go away into everlasting punishment. The Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not

* See Macknight on δια.

God; and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. The wrath of *God* abideth on him."

He that will judge the world, must know all the secrets of the human heart, and all the actions of human life. He must know the motive, he must know the quality of every act. He must know the different degrees of guilt, of different sins; and he must know the exact proportion of reward, which is promised to the various servants of God. What intelligence possesses this vast extent of knowledge? What intelligence can hold the balance, and weigh with perfect accuracy every thought, word, and action of the human race? What intelligence can hold the balance, and weigh out retribution in just proportion to human characters? What intelligence can hold the scales of justice in one hand, and the scales of mercy in the other; weigh with both, without partiality, and without interference? He, whose eyes are as a flame of fire, who searcheth the hearts, and trieth the reins of the children of men; he, whose mercy unites with justice without counteraction; he, who unites in himself divinity and humanity; he alone, is competent to judge between God and man.

The awful grandeur, which will attend Christ at the last day, proves his superior nature and dignity. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." He will come "in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory; and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. Before him shall be gathered all nations." To add, if possible, to the solemnity and grandeur of this scene, "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the

elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burnt up." Who is this personage, and what is his nature, who will display all this power and authority; who will receive all the honors, which heaven and earth can bestow, and will sit on the *right hand* of the Father? It is he, who was in a manger. It is he, who thought it not robbery to be equal with God. It is he, who searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men; who is "the true God;" who is "God over all, blessed for ever."

ON THE HUMILIATION AND EXALTATION OF JESUS CHRIST.

"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Philippians 2:6—11. Much ingenuity and learning have been bestowed upon this quotation of scripture to deprive it of its natural meaning, and to prove the Son's essential inferiority to the Father. The phrase, "being in the form of God," has been thought to import no more than that similarity of nature, which may subsist between a creature and its Creator; as God made man in his own *image*. If Christ had been in the form of God in this low sense only, he would have thought it robbery to represent himself to be equal with God. He would have considered it an infringement upon the divine prerogative. There would be no pertinency in the assertion of the apostle, that he was made in the likeness of men, and was found in fashion as a man. It would not be true that he humbled himself by appearing in this manner.

The time, in which the apostle says Christ was in the form of God, was prior to his incarnation. The word *form* (μορφη) in this passage does not signify nature or essential attributes. It signifies the external appearance, or similitude. It signifies that visible light, in which the Deity dwells, which no man can approach unto; and by which he appeared to the world before the incarnation. When Christ was transfigured, his *form* (according to the original) was changed; i. e. his outward appearance became different from what it was before. Whatever the *form of God* was, in which Christ was before he appeared in human nature, he laid it aside while he tarried upon earth, previous to his crucifixion. He made himself of no reputation. In the original it is, he divested himself; he laid aside those glorious appearances which he exhibited in heaven; and relinquished those divine honors which he there received. But during his humiliation, he did not lay aside his divinity; he did not lay aside his authority, nor his right to divine honors. He only concealed the glories of his divine nature, under the veil of humanity. On particular occasions he displayed divine power in the performance of miracles. At a time when he was with his disciples on a mountain, his appearance was changed. "His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. Jesus charged them, saying, tell the vision to no man until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." Christ used great precaution against displaying the glories of his nature. When he did display them, he did it on special occasions, for the special purpose of giving evidence that he was the Messiah.

"Christ, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." The latter part of this passage in the original, has been variously understood, and variously translated. Some have thought it imports that Christ did not think of the robbery of

making himself equal with God; that he was conscious he had no claim to such high pretensions; and therefore, he did not make them. Others have thus translated the text, he thought it not robbery to be *like* God. *This* translation reduces the sense of the original. The *other* wholly perverts it. The original word, (ισα,) which is rendered *like*, literally signifies *equal*, as the translators of the Bible have rendered it. If *like* were a correct translation of the original word, the apostle made no advance in sense, as he progressed in his observations. It would be worse than tautology to say, "who being in the form" (or likeness) of God, thought it not robbery to be *like* God. The phrase, "form of God," imports divine likeness. Having said that he was in the likeness of God, it amounts to nothing, to say, it was not robbery to be in the likeness of God; or to be what he was. The apostle Paul was too well versed in language to be guilty of such gross incorrectness. Likeness does not necessarily imply equality. Let the apostle say, who being in the form or likeness of God, thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God, and he rises in his ideas, as he progresses in his observations. Judicious critics in the Greek language admit that the translation of this passage, as it stands in the Bible, is correct. If any *creature* should claim equality with God, it would be a daring robbery of divine honors. If Christ be not eternal, self-existent and independent, he cannot *justly* claim equality with God. A learned and distinguished divine,* of the beginning of the last century, speaking of the correctness of the translation of the text under consideration, as it stands in the Bible, observes, "The ancientest versions of the New Testament favor this rendering; the Greek and Latin fathers, from the fourth century downwards, do as plainly countenance it. Nay, Tertullian of the second or third century, seems to have understood it in the same sense. The

* Waterland.

words will, in strict propriety, bear it; and not only so, but more naturally and properly than any other."

Although Christ claimed equality with God; yet "he made himself of no reputation;" he divested himself of the form of God, and relinquished those honors, which he had received; "and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made" (or born) "in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." His taking the *form* of a servant, does not mean that he was actually a servant; that he was under those restraints, which are peculiar to a state of servitude. But he had the appearance of a servant. He performed the duties of a servant. He said to his disciples, "I am among you as he who serveth." Like a servant, he had no property; he lived in poverty, and was used with contempt. "At length he died the death of a condemned slave; being publicly scourged and crucified."

Christ's being born in the likeness of men does not mean that he had the appearance of a man without the reality. The original word (ὁμοιωμα) signifies not only likeness, but sometimes sameness of nature. (See Macknight on the text.) Christ had a human body; he had human passions. He felt those joys and afflictions, which are common to humanity. "Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." He not only took upon himself human nature and appeared in fashion as a man, exposed to all the natural evils common to human life. He not only humbled himself to do the obliging offices of a servant; but he became obedient unto death, even to the most ignominious death. He, who had shared divine honors in heaven with the Father, condescended to assume human nature; to appear in the lowest condition of human life; to receive all the ignominy and reproach which the world could cast upon him; and to suffer

his body, with which he had been in the most intimate union, to expire under the tortures of the cross.

If Christ was only a man, there is nothing very peculiar in his state of humiliation. There is nothing surprising that a man should have been born in the likeness of men and be found in fashion as a man. There is nothing surprising that a man should be in the form of a servant and do the duties of a servant. It is not a singular case that a man has suffered the tortures of the cross. Nor is it a singular case that a man has died in defence of his religion, whether it was true or false. But that he, who claimed *equality* with God, should descend to this low condition is a degree of humiliation to which created intelligence cannot descend.

On account of Christ's exceedingly great condescension and humiliation, God hath exalted him exceedingly; "and given him a name, which is above every name." As a consequence or reward of Christ's sufferings, God hath exalted him. He hath raised him from that low condition, in which he was upon earth, and exalted him to that glory, which he had with the Father before the world was. Christ humbled himself in union with human nature, and he will be exalted in union with the same nature. Some have supposed that Christ's exaltation has made *real* additions to his dignity and glory. They argue that divinity is incapable of advancement, and of course they infer that he is not divine. It is readily granted that no real accession can be made to divinity. It is as perfect and glorious at one point in duration as at another. Before creation, before redemption, Christ was as perfect in his nature as he is now. He had power to create, and he had power to redeem. As he had not then exercised those powers, the honor of those works could not be actually ascribed to him. If he had not descended from heaven to earth, and stooped to the lowest conditions of human nature, he could not be glorified for his condescension. If he had not suffered

and died, the glory of redemption would not have been ascribed to him. The attributes, which he has displayed in the work of redemption, appear more distinguishing than those he displayed in creation. He *appears* more exalted than he would have done, if he had not performed this work. God has given him the name Jesus, signifying Savior, which is above every name; and he requires all, who are in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, to worship him, not only as Creator and Lord, but as *Savior* of the world. Before his incarnation he was not honored as *actual* Savior. But since he has wrought out a complete redemption, and returned to heaven, a new glory appears, and higher honors are attributed to him than those he received before his incarnation. After he had completed the work of redemption by rising from the dead, he declared to his disciples that *all* authority was given to him in heaven and in earth; and when he ascended to heaven he was seated on the *right hand* of the Father. Because he was the Son of man; because he did great and benevolent deeds in his union with human nature all judgment was committed to him.

This high exaltation of the Son will be to the glory of God the Father. Is it possible that any creature is raised to such an amazing degree of elevation above every other creature, and be the object of their most respectful homage? Is it possible that God has admitted a creature to his right hand, and suffers him to possess all authority? Would this be for the glory of God the Father? Such is the union of nature, design and operation, between the Son and the Father, that they, who honor the Son, honor the Father; and what exalts and glorifies one, exalts and glorifies the other. If this inseparable union of nature do not subsist between the Father and the Son, two distinct and separate objects are holden forth, each of which commands supreme love and veneration, and we are

left in the unavoidable dilemma of paying religious homage to two divinities, or to none.

Christ in his state of exaltation makes intercession for believers. In that body which was offered in sacrifice, he appears before the Father in their behalf. He pleads the merits of his own sufferings, and the Father, who remembers his covenant and loves his Son, hears his requests, and his intercession is effectual.*

* The phrase, *form of God*, (μορφη Θεου,) may be explained by the subsequent phrase, *form of a servant*, (μορφην δουλου.) The word *form*, in the latter phrase, does not signify reality, or nature. For Christ was not literally a servant, or bondman, to any one. But he assumed the *appearance* of one in this low condition; and occasionally officiated in this servile capacity. Christ said to his disciples, "I am among you as he that serveth," Luke 22:27. If the *form* of a servant does not literally signify a servant, the *form* of God does not literally signify God. But the word *form*, in connexion with God, expresses the resemblance of appearance, on the same ground as it does when it is used in connexion with servant. If it was in human nature, Christ appeared in the *form* of a servant, it appears to be a fair conclusion, it appears to be giving equal meaning to the word *form* in both cases, that it was in divine nature he appeared in the form of God.

It is evident from the language of the apostle, that Christ was in the form of God, *before* he was in the form of a servant. This proves his pre-existence. The primitive form of God, which he possessed, was undoubtedly that glory which he had with the Father before the world was; and to be restored to which he prayed. This construction appears evident, both from fact and from the language of the apostle. It is fact that when Christ was upon earth, he had not that glory, that form of God, which he had before. This is proved by his prayer, "O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee *before the world was*," John 17:5. The apostle's language is consonant with this. But made himself of no reputation. (εαυτον εκενωσε.) These words literally signify, *he divested, or emptied himself*. But of what did he divest himself? Not of his original nature, nor of his miraculous powers. For he retained both while he was upon earth. He undoubtedly divested himself of that, which he formerly had; but of which he was then destitute. This was the glory, or the form of God, which he had with the Father before the world was.

We do not maintain that this, simply considered, proves the divinity of Christ. But let us proceed with the apostle, in his consequence, as he rises on the subject. *Thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* It is not necessary to quote all the translations of this contested text. Some of the best critics of the Greek language, have decided that our common translation is correct. The principal difference of opinion respecting this text, at the present day, arises from the different translations of the word ισα. Some translate it *equal;* others translate it *as*, or *like*. It is agreed on both sides that ισος, from which ισα is derived, signifies *equal*. But we are not informed by what authority, or by what misfortune, the derivative has lost more than half its meaning in its descent from its primitive. The original word in the New Testament, standing for *like* and *as*, is not, as far as I have examined, ισα. That it should occur in this place, for the first time in this sense, appears not a little extraordinary. A remark of the learned Poole, on this word, is pertinent and forcible. *Nam verba substantiva cum adverbio sæpi adverbii significationem faciunt nomenclem.* This signification of an adverb, in connexion with a substantive verb, he proves by quotations from Homer.

The connexion of the apostle's discourse renders it necessary that ισα should signify *more* than likeness. The expression, *form of God* signifies, at least, as much as divine likeness. Admitting the position, in the first place, that Christ was *like* God, the apostle said nothing to the purpose, if he only said that Christ

thought it not robbery to be *like* God; i. e. he thought it not robbery to be *like* what he was *like*. The learned apostle did not waste his words in such repetition, such impertinence.

The design of the apostle was to inculcate a spirit of humility from the example of Christ. But if Christ was only *like* God, in consequence of extraordinary communications made to him, his humiliation was no greater, to appearance, than the humiliation of the prophets and apostles; at least, it was not of a different kind. For they were endued with extraordinary gifts, and they officiated as servants of the people. But they are not exalted as Christ was. The reason is plain. Being creatures, they were not capable of so low humiliation as the Son of God was; neither were they capable of such exceeding exaltation.

Christ not only divested himself of divine glory while he was upon earth; but he humbled himself in his human nature. He not only lived like a servant, but he died like a malefactor. He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; a death the most painful, and the most ignominious. This he suffered, not by compulsion, but voluntarily. In consequence of this low state of humiliation, God highly exalted him. He restored him to that glory, which he originally had; and made all intelligent beings bow the knee in religious veneration at his name; and every tongue confess that he is Lord of all. This exaltation, which was the consequence, or reward of his humiliation, added nothing to his real dignity, nor to the attributes of his nature. But it displayed perfections of his nature, which would not otherwise have been manifested; and it called forth honors from his creatures, which would not otherwise have been rendered.

CHRIST'S DIVINITY ARGUED FROM THE PLACE HE HOLDS IN OUR SYSTEM OF RELIGION, AND IN BELIEVERS' HEARTS.

In the history of creation, God, without the revealed distinctions of Father, Son and Spirit, is the grand agent; the grand object of love and reverence. He created the world and tenanted it with animal and intelligent life; and established laws for their support and regulation. This history is concise; and the period, from the date of creation till the apostasy, is undoubtedly short. Here commences a new era; here a new and prominent personage rises to view. A new character is exhibited to repair the ruins of the fall; and this character runs through the Old; and it is the leading, the distinguishing subject of the New Testament.

Immediately after the history of creation, the history of redemption begins. No sooner is human nature defaced, than a method begins to be unfolded, by which it is to be repaired. It was early promised that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. A promise of similar import was made to Abraham; "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." It is evident that this prediction related to Jesus Christ, because the apostle Paul quoted it in allusion to him, "The scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached

before the *gospel* unto Abraham, saying, *in thee shall all nations be blessed.*" This promise was repeated to Abraham; and it was renewed to his son Isaac. Jacob, when blessing his sons, spoke in the language and in the spirit of prophecy. When he came to bless his son Judah, he perceived that from him the Messiah would descend; and he pronounced this striking prophecy, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." When laws were given to Israel to regulate their conduct in the land of promise, a prediction concerning the Messiah was also communicated by Moses. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me, unto him shall ye hearken." When Balaam took up his parable respecting Israel, the most prominent part of his prediction related to the Messiah. He speaks of him under the similitude of a Star, that should come out of Jacob, and a Sceptre that should rise out of Israel.

As the time of Christ's advent approached, prophets appear to have been endued with a greater portion of the spirit of prophecy. They appear to have had clearer views of the Messiah; and they predicted his coming with greater clearness and precision. The prophet Isaiah had a clear and animating view of the Messiah. So lively were his apprehensions, that he gave some of his prophetic descriptions in the present time. In view of the nativity of Jesus, he said, "The Lord himself shall give you a sign, behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given;

and the government shall be upon his shoulder. Behold my Servant, whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. Thus saith the Lord God, behold I lay in Zion for a foundation, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a *sure* foundation." The same prophet proceeds to describe his state of humiliation. "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and we hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, &c.—He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities."

Other prophets had a view of an approaching Savior; and they foretold his coming. They even pointed out the time and place of his nativity. "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt. Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in Israel. Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy King cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass; and a colt, the foal of an ass. One shall say unto him, what are these wounds in thy hands? Then shall he answer, those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends. They weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. Awake, O sword; smite the Shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered. They pierced my hands and my feet. They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture. He was numbered with transgressors. Thou wilt not

leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. They shall look on me whom they have pierced."

These are some of the prophecies in the Old Testament, which relate to the Messiah. So important and conspicuous a place did they hold in the Jewish scriptures that Christ was the grand object of the desires and expectations of the nation of the Jews. It is evident that these predictions related to the Messiah, because they were visibly fulfilled in him.

Other characters and other events, are also predicted in the Old Testament. Cyrus was foretold; he was called by name. He was appointed to an important place; to do important business; to subdue nations; to loose the loins of kings. But he was only an *instrument* in the hand of God, by whom he did his pleasure on Babylon. He is only glanced at in prophecy. His deeds were of limited consequence; nor were they followed by a lasting and important train of events. John the Baptist was foretold. But his character becomes interesting and distinguishing, principally because he was the forerunner of him, that should come. Like the harbinger of the morning, he shone with considerable distinction till the Sun of righteousness arose; then his lustre was lost in the splendor of the great Light of the world. But Christ was the grand object of prophecy, from the apostasy till his appearance in the world. Patriarchs and prophets, by an eye of faith, saw his day and were glad. Balaam, a prophet of the Gentiles, saw the Star of Jacob shining at a distance; and under the guidance of God's Spirit he blessed Israel with a promise of a Savior. The believing Jews understood those prophecies, which particularized the Messiah, purporting a divine Redeemer. Those appearances of divinity, recorded in the Old Testament, were undoubtedly understood to be those of the Son of God. Moses, by faith, had knowledge of Christ; for he "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than

the treasures of Egypt." God sent his Angel before Israel in the wilderness. He informed them that his name was in him. He cautioned them not to provoke him. They undoubtedly understood that this Angel was Christ. The apostle Paul says, some of them tempted *Christ*, and were destroyed of serpents. All other prophecies in the Old Testament, are of small consideration, excepting in their connexion with the prophecies respecting the Messiah; or as they have a bearing upon his coming into the world. The prophecies respecting the rise and fall of nations and empires are of small importance, excepting in their bearing upon the kingdom of the Redeemer. The prophecies respecting the nation of the Jews, derive almost all their importance from this consideration, they were the people, to whom the Messiah was revealed; and from whom he was to descend.

The most important events recorded in the Old Testament, relate, in some way, to the Messiah. The preservation of Noah and his family, from the general destruction by the deluge, represents, in a lively manner, the preservation of the church by Christ, from the destruction of the corrupt mass of the world. Abraham was called that he might receive a revelation of an approaching Savior. Isaac was spared, when his father was just ready to sacrifice him upon the altar, because, from him the desire of nations was to descend. Jacob and his family were preserved during a long famine, because from his lineage a Savior was to arise. They were selected to be the peculiar depository of divine revelation, and from whom a Savior was to proceed. For this purpose they were preserved, in a great measure, distinct from other people. For the same purpose they were preserved in Egypt; delivered from bondage; miraculously preserved in their passage through the Red Sea; supported in the wilderness; led to Canaan, and carried through all their vicissitudes, till the grand Object of their expectations appeared. The history

of the Old Testament would lose much of its importance and interest, were it not for its distinguishing character, the Messiah.

Sacrifices and offerings were early instituted by divine authority. Rites and ceremonies were established. Types and symbols denoted that some great personage would appear. Of what importance was the blood of beasts; of what importance was it to burn their bodies in sacrifice on the altar? Of what importance were all the rites and ceremonies, which were instituted? The blood of beasts had not virtue in itself to take away sin. But it represented the blood of the Lamb of God, which was to make expiation for the sins of the world. It became an expiation for sin *only*, as it was appointed to represent the precious blood of Jesus, which was offered as an expiatory sacrifice. The Jewish rites and ceremonies were important *only*, as they were appointed to prefigure some trait in his character, some circumstance in his life, or some feature in his offices. Priests were appointed by divine authority, to make intercession for the people; and to offer sacrifice upon the altar. Their character and office became important *only*, as they were appointed emblems of the character and office of the Savior. The grand scope of the Old Testament history, of the prophecies, of the promises, of the sacrifices, of the types and shadows, was the Messiah. They derive their importance from their concentration in him. Blot this grand personage from the Old Testament, and its history becomes insipid; its promises become fallacious; its sacrifices lose all their efficacy; its types and shadows are shadows still; and the Jewish economy was but a prototype of the present, gross idolatries of the eastern nations.

The New Testament commences with a history of the same illustrious character. Preparations are fully made. The predicted time arrives. Representations cease; and the glorious reality, the Desire of all nations, appears. The first books of the New Testament

give a history of the birth, life, and death of Jesus Christ. In these books he inculcates, upon his own authority, a system of the most sublime and interesting truths, demands assent; and by the same authority he lays down a system of rules for the regulation of human life. He exhibits himself in union with the Father; doing the same works, which the Father did; and claiming the same honors. He exhibits himself Savior of the world; requires faith in his name; requires supreme love; requires the relinquishment of every thing for his sake. Upon his own authority, and by virtue of his own merits, he promises forgiveness of sin, upon conditions, which he proposes. He holds all authority in heaven and on earth. He sends the Holy Spirit into the human heart, to prepare a people for himself. He magnifies the divine law, and makes it honorable, by making a propitiation for sin. He is the foundation of the church; and his word secures it against every attack. He will raise the dead; judge the world, and distribute retribution.

To confirm these truths he exhibited a holy life; and in his own name he performed works, which almighty power alone could perform. To confirm the faith of his followers, as well as to make expiation for sin, he suffered what he had predicted. He commissioned apostles to spread and inculcate the religion, which he had taught. He vested them with authority to work miracles in *his* name. In their writings they illustrated and enforced *his* doctrines. The most prominent feature of their epistles was Jesus Christ crucified; and the remission of sin through faith in *his* name. If they gloried, they gloried in *Christ.* They gloried in tribulation for *his* sake. They rejoiced that they were accounted worthy to suffer for Jesus Christ.

The revelation which Jesus Christ made to St. John, completes the sacred Scriptures; and it completes the history of the world. The leading subject of this book is Christ and his church. This subject runs

through the whole New Testament. It is its life and its spirit.

Who is this personage that appears so often in the Old, and breathes in almost every line of the New Testament? Is it a man, a mere man? Was it for a man, that a series of prophets during four thousand years predicted his coming, and longed to see his day? Was it in allusion to a man, that during this long period, beasts without number were consumed upon the altar? Was it to represent a man, that, during this long period, types and shadows were used? Or was it for a super-angelic creature, or for a temporary, limited dependent son, that the vast preparations of four thousand years were made? Was it to introduce either of these into the world, that the wheels of providence rolled on undisturbed during this vast length of time? The preparation would then be vastly disproportionate to the dignity of the personage. The representation would far exceed the reality. Infinite wisdom decides against this disproportion. Would the divine Being employ a second volume to give the character, and record the doctrines and precepts of any of his most exalted creatures? Would he give to the world a religion formed by created wisdom?

Extraordinary characters are left upon sacred record, which represent Jesus Christ. So illustrious was Abraham, that he was called the father of many nations; the father of believers. But Christ was King of kings and Lord of *all*. In him *all* nations of the earth were blessed. He is the Head of the church. His union with believers is more intimate, supporting and endearing than was Abraham's. Moses was appointed to be as God unto Pharaoh. He delivered a nation from bondage. He wrought miracles. He covered Egypt with plagues. He was admitted to the mount where God was; and when he returned, the skin of his face shone. He is a lively representation of the Messiah. But the Messiah suffers no diminution of character by contrast with this illustrious

man. Christ was with God not a few days only; but *from the beginning he was with God.* He came not for the deliverance of one nation only; but for the deliverance of all the nations of the earth, not from temporal calamities, but from spiritual bondage. When he wrought miracles, he wrought them not to plague the land; but to do good to the people; to confirm his authority; to display the mighty power of God; and he wrought them in his own name and by his own might. At the time of his transfiguration, splendor was not confined to his face; nor was his brightness reflected by *beholding* the glories of the Deity. But his divinity, as if impatient of confinement in a human body, burst through the vail, and covered his whole body with light. Not like Moses did he conceal his glories by wrapping them in a vail lest people should pay undue respect. But he suffered his disciples to gaze, admire, and pay him homage. Moses never communicated power to others to work miracles; for his power was from God, and he could not transfer it. But Christ commissioned apostles to work miracles in *his* name; and he commissioned them upon his own authority. When Moses died, the Lord buried him, and suffered no man to know the place of his sepulchre, lest people should go to his grave and pay divine honors to that illustrious man. But such precaution was not used at the interment of the body of Jesus. What is the conclusion? There was no danger that people would pay too high honors to the Savior.

Other patriarchs and prophets represented Jesus Christ. But they represented only some individual trait in his character. They were but obscure representations. If such and so many illustrious characters were employed to prefigure the Messiah, very great must he be, who was thus represented. As God made a visible distinction between those miracles, which were wrought by his servant upon Egypt, and those, which the magicians did by their enchantments, so he has made a visible distinction between the

Messiah and all those illustrious characters, which prefigured him.

Christ suffers no diminution of character in contrast with the highest orders of created intelligences, of which we have knowledge. Angels are his ministering servants. At his birth an angel was sent to announce the joyful event; and a multitude of the angelic host sang praise to God in the highest, on that important occasion. Angels afforded Christ their ministering aid while he suffered the hardships of life; and especially while he suffered agony in the garden. They will wait upon him in the clouds of heaven at the last day. When he came into the world, divine authority required that all the angels of God should worship him. To none of the angels did God ever say, sit thou at my right hand. But to the Son he said, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever." It is evident that Christ is a being of more exalted nature and character than the angels. To whom then shall he be likened; or with whom shall he be compared?

He is far above all creatures. He is their Creator. By him *all* things consist. He is the Author, he is the Substance of our religion. He is the believer's hope.

The representations, which the sacred Scriptures give of Jesus Christ are calculated to convince mankind that he is a divine character. He is the leading subject; he is the most prominent character of our system of religion. The Scriptures attribute to him the qualities, the works, the names, the honors which they give to God. When people called him divine; when they worshipped him as if he were divine, he never charged them with error. He indulged, he encouraged the deception, if deception it was. Moses used caution to prevent a superstitious people from venerating him as a Deity. John the baptist, to prevent people from mistaking himself for him that should come, declared that he was not the Christ; that he was not worthy to unloose the latchet of his

shoes. When the apostles, by signs and wonders excited the admiration of the people at Lystra; and they reputed them as gods, and would have offered sacrifice to them, they corrected the error, and forbade the idolatry. When the angel, whom Christ sent to testify unto the churches, had finished the work of his mission with John, he fell down to worship the angel; but the angel said, "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant.—Worship God." When the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, and the angel, excited the veneration of people, they were cautious to disclaim all pretensions to divine honors. They suffered not their idolatry. Christ excited the veneration of men more than they. Through belief of his divinity they rendered him divine honors. Had he been only a created being; and had he been a holy being; and had he been jealous for the honor of God's name, like them he would have refused their worship; he would have forbidden their impiety. But when worship was offered him he received it with complacency.

If the Scriptures are true, there appears to be decisive evidence that Christ is divine; and they are calculated to convince mankind of this truth. They ascribe as much excellence, and as much honor to Christ as they ascribe to the Father. The Christian church has, from its first establishment, ascribed divinity and divine honors to the Son of God. If some, with the Scriptures in their hands, have attempted to rob Christ of divine glory; others, with the same Scriptures, have attempted to do the same to God the Father. These are exceptions, which prove the darkness of the understanding and the obduracy of the human heart.

In every age of the world, people have manifested a strong propensity to idolatry. They were not less prone to this impiety when Christ was upon earth, and when his system of religion was committed to writing. Would God set his seal to a system of relig-

ion, which attributed divine nature and divine prerogatives to one of his creatures? Would he suffer his church to be thus imposed on from the beginning of the world to the present day, and to the end of time; and by his word encourage the error? If the Scriptures may be credited; if Christ was sincere and spoke the truth, there appears to be as high evidence, as language can afford, that Christ is divine.

CHRIST THE AUTHOR OF SALVATION.

"THERE is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," Acts 4:12. The sacred scriptures abundantly testify that human nature, by the apostasy, lost its purity and dignity; lost divine approbation; contracted guilt, and incurred the displeasure of heaven. The sacred scriptures testify that from this sinful, unhappy condition, it could not, by its own power and wisdom, extricate itself. Without foreign aid it must for ever remain in a state of sin and wretchedness. The same sacred scriptures reveal a Savior; a personage, who came to seek and save that which was lost. He was early promised to the world; and he was revealed by the name Savior. Salvation was promised through him. God, by his prophet declared, saying, "Israel shall be *saved* in the Lord, with an everlasting *salvation*." By the same prophet he foretold the blessing of the Messiah to the world. "I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my *salvation* unto the end of the earth. My *salvation* is gone forth, the isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they trust. In those days shall Judah be *saved*, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name wherewith he shall be called, The Lord, our Righteousness."

A short time before Christ was born, an angel appeared unto Joseph, and directed him to call the child, which was to be born of Mary, Jesus. This name was given him on account of its appropriate

signification. He was to be a Savior; and the name Jesus, has that import. Christ said of himself, "The Son of man is come to *save* that which was lost." Zacharias, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, said, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people; and hath raised up an horn of *salvation* for us." At the birth of Christ an angel declared the joyful event, saying, "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a *Savior*, which is Christ the Lord." The devout Simeon took the child Jesus in his arms. Under the influence of God's Spirit, and in rapture with the prospect of Christ's blessings, he said, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy *salvation*." Christ, speaking of the love of God said, "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be *saved*." Christ repeatedly conveyed the idea that he was the Savior of the world; and the universal tenor of his works confirmed his word.

The apostles abundantly inculcated the sentiment that Christ is the Savior of the world. "Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be *saved*. Christ Jesus came into the world to *save* sinners. He is also able to *save* them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him. The Father hath sent the Son to be the *Savior* of the world." It is a prominent doctrine of the New Testament that Christ is the Savior of the world.

Christ saves sinners from their sins. When he surveyed mankind after the apostasy, and by his all-seeing eye looked through every generation to the close of time, he perceived that all were corrupt; that all had gone out of the way; that there was none that did good, no not one. He perceived that they might be saved from their sins; and he undertook the work. He had authority to send the Holy Spirit into the world to repair human nature; to support and

comfort people in the way of obedience. This step was necessary, because, according to divine constitution, no unclean thing was suffered to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Christ had authority to adopt and prosecute this method; for all authority in heaven and on earth was given to him. When he saw his disciples sorrowful because he was about to leave the world, he promised to send them the Comforter, who would reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; and who would guide them into all truth, and teach them all things. The scriptures attribute a change of heart, or the washing of regeneration to the Holy Spirit. As Christ sends the Holy Spirit into the world to do this office, the same work, the work of sanctification is attributed to him. Paul, to the Corinthians, makes his salutation to those who are *sanctified* in Christ Jesus. He adds, "ye are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus." By sanctifying sinners by his Spirit, Christ saves sinners from their sins. Those, who are born of his Spirit are saved from the dominion of sin. They cease to relish it. They cease to practise it habitually. They are saved from the bondage of the great adversary. If sanctification be not complete in this life; if they, at times fall into transgression, yet they experience a great deliverance from sin and from the power of the great adversary; and they are brought into the liberty of the sons of God.

Christ saves the human body from the dominion of death. In consequence of sin, a sentence of mortality was pronounced upon the human race. This sentence, with a few individual exceptions, and with the exception of those, who will be living on the earth at the day of the resurrection, has been, and will be carried into execution. The human family generally have been and will be under the empire of death. Christ has given assurance that death will, one day, be swallowed up in victory; that he will reanimate and reorganize the lifeless bodies of the human race, and render them immortal.

Christ not only saves sinners from sin; their bodies from a continuation of death; but he saves their souls from destruction. He has obtained reprieve for the human race. He has magnified the divine law and made it honorable. He has proposed conditions, favorable conditions to the guilty race of man, on which he will forgive their sins, and present them to the Father justified in his sight. Had not Christ interposed in behalf of sinners; became a curse for them, they must have suffered the penalty of the law, and be for ever banished from the enjoyment of God, and suffer his indignation for ever. But Christ has prepared the way for the return of sinners to holiness and happiness. He offers gracious conditions on which he will restore them; and he affords aid to assist them to fulfil those conditions. He has given assurance that he will save from the second death all those, who repent of sin and put their trust in him.

Christ saves sinners by his own sacrifice. He made his soul an offering for sin. By this sacrifice he supported the honor of God's law; and the rights of God's throne while he procured remission of sin for penitent sinners.

After Jesus Christ had paid a ransom for sinners, he was in a capacity to make intercession with the Father for those, who believed on his name. The Sacred Scriptures bear testimony that he is a Mediator; makes intercession for believers; and that his intercession will be prevalent. "There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. He is the Mediator of a better covenant. He made intercession for the transgressors. Who also maketh intercession for us. We have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." God by covenant has assured his Son that he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. A portion of the human race will listen to the calls of the Gospel; will yield to the influences of the Holy Spirit and embrace the Savior. For this portion of

the human race, Christ will intercede. The Father delighteth in his Son and he delighteth to grant his requests. None that cometh to the Father by him shall in any wise be cast out.

The near relationship, which subsists between Christ and his subjects, argues that he will save them. He is the Ruler of his people. He is frequently styled, in the Scriptures, Governor and King. God, by the Psalmist, saith, "I have set my King upon my holy hill of Zion." The prophet Zechariah, in view of the approach of the Messiah, breaks out in this elevated strain, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout O daughter of Jerusalem, thy *King* cometh unto thee, he is just and having *salvation*." Nathanael, that Israelite, in whom was no guile, addressed Christ in the most decisive language; "Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." It was prophesied of the Messiah, that the government should be upon his shoulder. As Christ is King of his people, he will save them from all their enemies. It is the characteristic of a good ruler, as he has ability, to save his subjects from their foes; to deliver them from evils, and secure them from danger. Christ is a wise, powerful, and good Ruler. He will therefore save his own peculiar people. If he suffers them, at times, to be chastised by their enemies; he suffers it no farther than it serves as salutary discipline. He will finally lead them to victory and to salvation.

Christ styles himself a shepherd, "the good Shepherd." As it is the duty of a shepherd to feed his sheep and secure them from beasts of prey; so Christ supports his flock; secures them from their enemies, and finally saves them. Christ claims the relationship of bridegroom to his church. This figurative appellation conveys the idea of the most intimate union, and of the most endearing care and affection. A mother may forget her tender offspring, but Christ declares that he will not forget his church. Arguments need not be multiplied to prove that Jesus Christ is the

Author of salvation. The Sacred Scriptures bear testimony to the truth of this doctrine; and if they be true, the doctrine of salvation by Christ is also true. Upon this ground mankind are, with propriety, required to put their trust in him; to apply to him for every aid, and commit their highest concerns to his hands.

The inference then is plain that Christ is not merely a man. The Scriptures expressly declare, "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm." But, "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." It is not reasonable that a mere man could work out such a complete righteousness, that offers of pardon and salvation could be consistently made to the human race. No man liveth, or ever lived, and sinned not. Consequently no man can save himself. He can make no expiation for his own sins, excepting by suffering the threatened penalty. If he cannot save himself, it is presumable that he cannot save others. If a man were appointed to be the author of salvation, by making satisfaction for sin, by officiating as mediator between God and the human race, and forgiving their offences; it would greatly diminish the dignity of the divine character; it would greatly diminish the evil of sin; it would greatly diminish the price and the value of salvation; it would contract every part of the work of redemption.

Similar objections lie against the hypothesis that a superangelic creature was the author of salvation. Whoever the Savior is, whatever his nature and his character are, the Sacred Scriptures attribute to him the highest excellences; the highest honors; the highest authority; and require the highest love to be exercised toward him. God has given us the Sacred Scriptures to be the object of our faith and the rule of our practice. Can it be supposed that God, who is jealous for the honor of his name; who is jealous for the rights of his throne, would appoint a creature, (of

however exalted nature,) to take his place; to receive his authority; to do his works; to receive the glory which is due only to himself and be the object of the highest love of the human race? Will God suffer a creature to be on equality with himself in the work of redemption, the noblest of all his works? Will he, who has manifested the strongest displeasure against idolatry, encourage, nay, require the human race to pay divine honors to one of his creatures? There is not such inconsistency; there is not such contradiction in the divine Mind.

It is rational to suppose that the Author of salvation has a nature and character proportionate to the work. It appears that it would require as great power, as deep wisdom, as much goodness, to repair and restore a ruined world, as it required to create it. He alone, that required obedience to the divine law, has authority to forgive sin. He alone that formed the mechanism of the human mind can repair it. He alone that organized the human body and animated it with a rational soul, can reorganize and reunite it with its kindred spirit. He alone that hath all authority in heaven and in earth, can distribute reward and punishment at the day of judgment. He that doth these things is Christ; and consequently Christ is divine.

ON THE MEDIATORIAL OFFICE OF JESUS CHRIST.

To form correct ideas of the nature and character of Jesus Christ, it is important to notice his offices and his duties arising from them. It is not from one attribute, one name, one office, or one work, we can learn the qualities of his nature. But from an examination of them all, we have a more extensive view of the subject; and shall more probably be unbiassed in our inquiries, and be better qualified to discover the truth. When we examine a large structure, we notice its parts; their connexion; and then the general design and appearance of the whole. When we contemplate on Jesus Christ, the subject appears so vast, that we need to examine it, as it were, by parts, or in different points of view. When we have made these distinct investigations, we can bring them together and see what is the amount of the whole. It will cast some light on this subject to examine the mediatorial office and work of Jesus Christ.

It appears that the Father has holden intercourse with mankind since the apostasy, through a mediator. He, who conversed with our first parents in Eden after their transgression, was probably the Word. The Angel, who appeared to the patriarchs and made important communications of the divine will; who led Israel out of Egypt, conducted them through the Red Sea, and directed them in the wilderness; who appeared many other times, and spoke with divine authority

and power, exhibited traits of character, which identify him with the Lord Jesus. He was the Angel of the covenant. So is Christ. He was the Mediator between God and mankind after the covenant of mercy began to be revealed. Christ is the Mediator of the new covenant. He was tempted in the wilderness. So was Christ. It was implicitly declared, that the Angel could forgive sin. When Christ was upon earth, he proved that he had authority to forgive sins. It is admitted by those, who grant that Christ is a Savior, that the saints, during the first four thousand years of the world, were saved in view of the merits, and through the mediation of Christ.

The Mediator between God and men, the apostle calls "the man Christ Jesus." From this and similar expressions in the Scriptures, it has been inferred, that Christ was merely a man. This inference does not appear to be conclusive. The Angel, who wrestled with Jacob, was called a man. Angels, who appeared at various times on special occasions, were called men. God himself is called a man, "a man of war." But this mode of expression does not prove that they were *really* men. The Angel, who wrestled with Jacob, and frequently appeared to the patriarchs, and those ministering angels, who were occasionally sent into the world on important business, were called men, because they assumed a human appearance. God is figuratively called a man of war, because he has power to overcome, and actually does overcome his enemies. But for other reasons, was Christ called a man. He really was a man. He was made flesh. He was made of a woman. He was tempted in all points like as we are. Because he was a man, it does not follow that he was simply a man. If the appearances of men had a different nature connected with them, there appears to be no absurdity, in admitting that a real man might have a different nature connected with him. If Christ consist of human and divine nature, it is not surprising that he should some-

times be called man, and sometimes God. He is called one or the other in the Scriptures, according to the subject of discourse. If the subject be his humanity, he is called man, or the Son of man. If the subject be his divinity, he is called God, or Son of God, or by some name, or in some way expressive of his divine nature. The apostle Paul, in his address to the rulers of the synagogue at a certain time, says, "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through *this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." He had just before spoken of his crucifixion and resurrection. As he had been speaking of him in respect to his human nature, it was proper and natural to continue to speak of him in respect to the same nature, till he had closed this subject of his discourse. Besides, it was through the *sufferings* of Christ that the forgiveness of sin is made possible. In another place, the same apostle says, "He has appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that man*, whom he hath ordained." In connexion with this, he spoke of his human nature; of the resurrection of his body. It was natural therefore to speak of him in this connexion by the name, or in the character of a man. Again he says, "For since by man came death, by *man* also came the resurrection of the dead." The same observations apply to this text. The apostle had been speaking of the resurrection of Christ's body, and was contrasting him with Adam. It was correct, therefore, to continue to speak of him, in that connexion, as a man. When he is exhibited in connexion with his work of creation, he is called God. When it is said he will raise the dead, he is called the Son of God. When he is contrasted with angels, and his vast superiority is set forth, he was addressed by the divine title, O God; a title significant of the nature, in which he had just been represented; and in which he was so much superior to the angels. If Christ be both human and divine, these observations shew the propriety of exhibiting

him sometimes in one nature and sometimes in the other. The connexion between the son of man and the Son of God, is so intimate that the name and properties of one are sometimes applied to the other. "The second *man* is the *Lord* from heaven." Here the humanity of Christ is called the Lord from heaven. "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." In this text, human blood is called the blood of God. "Which none of the princes of this world know, for had they known it, they would not have *crucified the Lord of glory*," 1 Cor. 2:8. In this text the tortures of the cross are applied to the *Lord of glory*, the divine nature of Jesus Christ. By this phraseology we are not to understand that the divinity of Christ suffered pain; but we are to understand the intimate connexion between his two natures. This kind of phraseology is not uncommon. We say, a man dies, when we only mean that his body suffers dissolution. We say, man will live for ever, when we only mean that his soul will never see death.

Jesus Christ, in his mediatorial office on earth, suffered deep humiliation of his divine nature, and extreme torture of his humanity. The Son of God not only took upon him human nature, but he took it in the form of a servant. He made himself of no reputation. He suffered the scorn and reproach of the wicked. The gracious miracles, which he wrought by his own divine power, were attributed to the operation of the evil spirit. The prayer, which he made to the Father to glorify him, with that glory which he had with him before the world was, implies that he was divested of his glory for a season, and that he was in a state of humiliation. So intimate was the union of his two natures, that all the ignominy which was directed against his human nature, extended to his divinity. He endured extreme suffering in his human nature. He was grieved for the hardness of the human heart. He wept over Jerusalem, when he beheld her approaching destruction. He was

touched with a feeling of our infirmities. He suffered the temptations of the great adversary, and the persecutions of those, whom he came to save. In the near approach of his crucifixion, when the tortures of the cross presented themselves to his mind, he almost recoiled at the prospect. He sweat, as it were, great drops of blood, and prayed that if it were possible the cup of suffering might pass from him. When he was suspended upon the fatal wood, and the Father withdrew his consoling presence, he exclaimed in the anguish of his soul, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Jesus Christ, by his humiliation and suffering, became fully qualified for the work of his mediatorial office. "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered. And being *made perfect*, he became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. It became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering," Hebrews 5:8, 9; and 2:10. By these declarations of the apostle we are not to understand that there was any imperfection in his nature, which was removed by his suffering; or that he was more perfect in his nature after, than he was before, his humiliation. But the things which he suffered, were a necessary qualification for his mediatorial office. The act of consecration was necessary under the law, to *perfect* men for the priest's office. But this act added nothing to their natural qualifications. So the sufferings of Christ were a necessary preparation for his mediatorial office; but made no addition to the perfection of his nature. Was there no Mediator then before the humiliation and sufferings of Jesus Christ? His mediation was then efficacious for man, and acceptable to the Father, by virtue and in view of his abasement, and the shedding of his blood, which were to take place. Saints, before the incarnation of the Son of

God, were saved by faith in a Savior to come; and the Son of God was an effectual Savior, during that period, by virtue of that sacrifice which he was to make.

The union of divine and human nature, the sufferings of the one, and the humiliation of the other, appear to be revealed truths; and they appear to be necessary qualifications for a Mediator between God and man. Were the Mediator only divine, one party only would be literally represented. He could not be touched with the feeling of human infirmities. He could not have a personal sympathy for suffering humanity. Nor could he *feel* what allowance ought to be made for the weakness of human nature. He could not suffer the penalty of the law for sin; and by suffering magnify and honor it. Condescension and concession would appear to be only on the part of Deity. On the other hand, if the Mediator were only of a human or created nature, one party only would be literally represented. It is not probable he would have an adequate knowledge of all the rights and prerogatives of divine authority; at least, he could not have a *feeling sense* of them. He could do no more than his own personal duty. He could have no surplus of merit, which he could transfer to the destitute. He could make no expiation for sin; and without expiation, every instance of pardon would dishonor the divine law, and weaken divine authority. But by the union of the Son of God with the Son of man, both these difficulties are removed. Both parties are literally represented. Satisfaction can be made to the violated law of God; and the Father can be just while he justifies penitent sinners. In this method, "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other," Ps. 85:10. If a whole nation had revolted from their legal sovereign, what individual would be suitable to mediate between the parties to produce reconciliation? Would the King's son alone be suitable for the undertaking? However wise and virtuous, and benevolent he might be, would he alone probably accomplish the object?

Would not rebels view him with a jealous eye? Would an individual of the nation, one, who had not fallen into the same transgression, be suitable to mediate between the parties? However wise and virtuous he might be in his private capacity, would he have an adequate knowledge of the rights of his sovereign; and would he feel a suitable interest in the support and honor of his throne? Would he have adequate weight of character, either in the sight of his nation or of his sovereign, to produce reconciliation between them? Let him unite with the King's Son, in the work of mediation; and the plan appears more reasonable, and more probable of success. The application, in some important respects, cannot be misunderstood.

The man Christ Jesus, after his resurrection, received great honor and authority. He had endured extreme ignominy and suffering. But for the *joy that was set before him*, he endured the cross, despised the shame, *and is seated at the right hand of the throne of God.* Like other men, he had human feelings, and was actuated by a hope of reward. Many passages of sacred scripture represent the honor, or exaltation, which he received after his resurrection; and some of them represent it to be a consequence, or reward of his sufferings. "After the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God," Mark 16:19. "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, *and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places; far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,*" Eph. 1:20, 21. "When he had by himself purged our sins, *sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high,*" Heb. 1:3. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Savior," Acts 5:31. "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name;*

that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. 2:8—11. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, *for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor*," Heb. 2:9. In all these texts, it will be seen by examination, that the *man* Christ Jesus was exalted and honored. Divinity is incapable of absolute exaltation. The Son of God, who, for a time, divested himself of the form of God, might be said to be comparatively exalted, when he was restored to that glory, which he had with the Father, before the world was. But the foregoing texts evidently relate to the humanity of Christ.

After Jesus was risen from the dead, he said to his disciples, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Matt. 28:18. Before his crucifixion, when he was speaking of his power and authority, he said, "The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the *Son of God;* and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority *to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man*," John 5:25,26,27. "When the *Son of man* shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations," &c. Matt. 25:31,32. The apostle Paul, speaking of the resurrection and day of judgment, says, "He hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that *man* whom he hath ordained," Acts 17:31. From these and several other texts, it is evident that the resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment, are attributed sometimes to the Son of God, and the *Lord* Jesus Christ; and sometimes to the Son of man. When the subject of discourse is the man Christ Jesus, then these great works are ascribed to him as man, or Son of man.

When Christ would exhibit himself on an equality with the Father, in respect to the greatness of his works and the honor to be given him, he calls himself the *Son of God.* Speaking of the resurrection, he says, "the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." The cause he assigns, for which he is vested with authority to judge the world, is, that he is the Son of man. When the Son of God is called the Son of man, the expression is parallel with this text, "The Word was made flesh." By this phraseology, it is not to be understood that the Word, or Son of God, changed his nature and became only a man. But it is to be understood that he came into a peculiarly intimate union with a man. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same," Heb. 2:14. *His taking* flesh and blood implies that he, who took, and that, which was taken, were not identically the same.

Since the resurrection and ascension of the body of Jesus, the Son of man, in union with the Son of God, is seated on the throne, at the right hand of the Father. In this situation the martyr Stephen saw him just before his execution, when he was filled with the Holy Ghost and looked up to heaven. In this state of exaltation, the Son of man participates with the Son of God, the government of the mediatorial kingdom. At the last day, the man Christ Jesus in union and in joint operation with the divine Son, will raise the dead and judge the world. At this time, and in this union and joint operation with the Son of God, he will put down, or subdue, all rule and all authority and power, which were opposed to his mediatorial government. He will put all enemies under his feet. He will destroy death and him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. Then will the first Gospel prediction be fulfilled, "The Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." This work will he perform, and this exaltation will he receive as a reward of his sufferings.

This is a great work, and a great honor. Of this work and of this honor, the man Christ Jesus participates with the Son of God.

Now cometh the end of this economy. The mediatorial kingdom is completed. Christ delivers it up to God, even the Father. The mediatorial office and work terminate. A new dispensation commences. The Son himself, i. e. the Son of man, the man Christ Jesus, no longer exercises authority in that department, which has now ceased; but becomes subjected to him, who gave him this authority; and God, (Aleim) without the distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and without different departments of administration, which were manifested during the work of redemption, will be all in all. He will hold the reins of government, without any medium, as he did before the work of redemption commenced.

That the subjection of the *Son*, at the close of the mediatorial economy, signifies the subjection of the Son of man, or the man Christ Jesus, appears evident from the design and connexion of the apostle's discourse. He had been speaking of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. From his resurrection he argued the resurrection of the dead. "For since by man came death, by *man* also came the resurrection of the dead," 1 Cor. 15:21. Without the least intimation of change of the subject, he speaks of the subjection of the Son. It is a fair inference then, that this Son is the Son of man.

CHRIST THE ANGEL OF THE COVENANT.

"Behold I send an Angel before thee," Exodus 23:20. Many extraordinary appearances of an angel, or of the Angel of the Lord, are recorded in the Old Testament. It is important to know who this Angel was. Satisfactory information, on this subject, may be found in the names, which were given him, in what he said of himself; in what he did; and in the respect which was paid to him. The name *angel*, signifies *messenger*, or one sent. It designates not the *nature*, but the *office*, of the agent.

The Angel of the Lord appeared unto Hagar, after she had fled from her mistress; and commanded her to return and be subject to her authority. He promised her saying: "I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude. And she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God seest me," Gen. 16:10, 13. In this account of the Angel's appearance, it is noticable that he promised to do a work, which divine power alone could do; and he promised it in a style peculiar to God. "I will multiply thy seed exceedingly." He spoke, to appearance, upon his own authority; and it appears that Hagar understood him so; for "she called the name of the Lord, (יהוה) that spake unto her, *Thou God seest me.*"

After Hagar and her son were cast out from the house of Abraham; and she apprehended that her son would die for want of sustenance, "she lifted up

her voice and wept; and God heard the voice of the lad; and the Angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, what aileth thee, Hagar? fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand; for I will make him a great nation; and God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water," Gen. 21:16—19. In this history of the bond woman and her son, God, and the Angel of God, are represented, having the same knowledge, the same care, and the same authority over them. God heard the voice of the child. The Angel of God called to Hagar. God opened her eyes. The Angel of God promised to make the lad a great nation. There appears to be a certain distinction here made, between God, and the Angel of God; but in this history the latter does not appear inferior in the qualities of his nature to the former.

God tried Abraham; and commanded him to take his son Isaac and offer him for a burnt offering. Abraham obeyed. He took his son; went to the place, which God had told him of; built an altar; laid on the wood; bound his son; laid him upon the wood, and took the knife to slay him. "And the Angel of the Lord called to him out of heaven and said, Abraham, Abraham! and he said, here am I. And he said, Lay not thy hand upon the lad, neither do any thing unto him; for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from *me*. And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-jireh," i. e. *the Lord will see or provide.* "And the Angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, by myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son; that in blessing I will bless thee; and in multiplying, I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven," Gen. 21:11, 12, 14—17.

In the first of these two appearances of the Angel of the Lord, he speaks as God himself. He addressed Abraham in the same manner, and, to appearance, with the same authority, with which God had before addressed him. The offering of Isaac was to be made to God. But mark the words of the Angel. "For now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from *me*," Gen. 22:12. The conclusion is, that it was the same thing to offer his son to God, or to the Angel of the Lord. The second time the Angel called to Abraham, he speaks not his own words; but addresses him in the words of the Lord. But these words are precisely the same in effect, which the Angel had before spoken. The Angel said to Abraham, "seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son." The Lord said by the Angel, "because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son." The Angel passed *his* word respecting Ishmael, "I will make him a great nation." The Lord passed *his* word with an oath to Abraham, by the mouth of the Angel, "I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven." While a certain distinction is made between the Angel of the Lord, and the Lord himself, there is such a union manifested, that the Angel declares, upon his own authority, that a certain important purpose shall be accomplished. He then communicates the declaration of the Lord, to the same or similar effect. The offering of Isaac to God, according to his command, was not withholding him from the Angel; and it was also not withholding him from the Lord. It is hard to conceive that there should be such union, such intimacy, such equality between the Creator and a creature.

When Jacob was on his way from Laban to his own country, he was left alone; "and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day." This man changed his name, blessed him, and told him that he had power with God and with man, and that he

had prevailed. "And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face," Gen. 32:30. The prophet Hosea tells us who this man was, with whom Jacob wrestled. Speaking of Jacob he says, "By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the Angel, and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto him; he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us; even the Lord God of hosts; the Lord is his memorial," Hosea 12:3—5. The prophet testifies that the man, with whom Jacob wrestled was the Angel. He was probably called a man, because he assumed the appearance of a man. The prophet goes on and says, that Jacob found him, i. e. the Angel, in Bethel. We find that he, whom the patriarch found in Bethel, was the Lord, who said, "I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac.—And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place and I knew it not," Gen. 28:13, 16. The prophet calls this Angel "*the Lord God of hosts; the Lord is his memorial.*" It has been objected, that "when the scripture informs that it was the Angel of the Lord, who said, I am the God of Abraham," &c. the account is equally plain to the understandings of men, that he spake not his own words, or in reference to himself, but the words of Jehovah, or in the name of God.* If this objection were valid against what the Angel said of himself, it would not lie against what the prophet said of him. If a created angel could personate his Creator, by what figure of speech, by what license, could the prophet call him the Lord God of hosts; and say that "the Lord (i. e. Jehovah) is his memorial?"

When Moses kept the flock of his father-in-law at Horeb, "The Angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush; and he looked, and behold, the bush burned with fire; and

* Sherman.

the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside and see this great sight, why the bush is not burned. And when the *Lord* saw that he turned aside to see, *God* called to him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses, and he said, Here am I. And he said, draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. Moreover, he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon *God*," Ex. 3:2—6. During the interview between Moses and him who was in the bush, the Lord said unto him, "I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people, the children of Israel, out of Egypt," ver. 10. Moses then inquired of God, by what name he should call him, when he should go with his message to the children of Israel. "And God said unto Moses, *I am that I am;* and he said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you," ver. 14.

In this history we find that the Angel of the Lord appeared unto Moses. There is no mention that any other appeared to him in the bush. He that was in the bush called unto him; and we are informed by the inspired historian, that it was *God*, who called to him. It is a natural conclusion, therefore, that this Angel was the God who spake, who called himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; who called himself I AM, a name implying self-existence.

Stephen, in his answer to the council, before whom he was accused, gave a brief history from the time of Abraham to the time of Solomon. In this epitome he mentions the extraordinary appearance of the burning bush. Speaking of Moses, he says, "The same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer by the hand of the Angel, which appeared to him in the bush." The immediate agent who sent Moses, is, therefore, the Angel. In the history which Moses gives, we find but one agent, i. e. the immediate agent,

introduced, the Angel of the Lord. In the course of the history, we find, that, without any change of the subject, the Lord saw that Moses turned aside to see; God called unto him out of the midst of the bush; he said, I am the God of thy father; I will send thee to Pharaoh; *I am that I am.* The subject, and the only subject to which all these names refer, is the Angel of the Lord, ver. 2. Consequently, the names, Lord, God, and I AM, are applied to him. But if he were merely a created angel, and said and did nothing on this occasion, he is introduced to great disadvantage; and his appearance does not seem to answer any important purpose. But the fact is, he did send Moses to deliver the children of Israel; and we have divine testimony that God sent him.

After the Israelites had departed from Egypt, God led the people through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea. "And the *Lord* went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light," Ex. 13:21. When the Israelites had travelled as far as the Red Sea, and the Egyptians pressed hard upon them, it is recorded that, "The Angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them," Ex. 14:19. By a comparison of these two representations we find that he, who went before the children of Israel in a pillar of cloud to the Red Sea, was called the Lord. (יהוה) But on the shore of the Red Sea, he that was in the cloud changed his position, and went from before the camp of Israel, and stood behind them; and the cloud moved in like manner. He is here called the *Angel* of God. It is evident that he, who went before them, is he, who removed and went behind them. It follows, of course, that the Angel of God is the *Lord* himself.

Jehovah promised Moses that his presence (or his face) should go with him. We find that the divine

presence in the cloud, did accompany him and the people, during their journeyings in the wilderness. But we learn by Stephen, that it was the Angel, that was with Moses in the church in the wilderness. It follows, of course, that the presence of the Angel was the presence of Jehovah.

God, in his preface to the decalogue, addresses his servant Moses thus, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." He then proceeds to give him the law. But who was it that brought Moses out of Egypt? It was the Angel, who appeared to him in the bush, who styled himself I AM; and sent him to Pharaoh, to let Israel go; it was the Angel, who went before him in a pillar of cloud, to the borders of the Red Sea; and went behind him through the deep, to protect him from the Egyptian host; it was the Angel, who was with him in the wilderness, who protected, guided, and supported him. This Angel was called Jehovah; and I AM was his memorial. Stephen, speaking of Moses, testifies to the same effect. "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the *Angel*, which spake to him in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us," Acts 7:38. From this testimony it appears that the Angel, who was with Moses in the wilderness, spake the law to him; and it has been shewn that that Angel was the Lord Jehovah.

But the same Stephen testifies thus, "Who have received the law by the disposition of Angels," Acts 7:53. The apostle Paul, writing to the Galatians concerning the law, says, "It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator," Gal. 3:19. To the Hebrews he says, "if the word spoken by angels was steadfast," &c. From these declarations, it has been inferred that angels gave the law from Sinai. Enough has been said to shew that he, who led Israel out of Egypt, guided them in a pillar of cloud, and appeared

in the bush, gave the law from mount Sinai; and that the Angel, who performed this was not a created angel, but was Jehovah. Moses states expressly, that Jehovah descended upon the mount in fire; that Jehovah conversed with him; that God spake all these words, viz. the words of the law. It is necessary therefore to reconcile the account, which Moses gives of the publication of the law, with the account which Stephen and the apostle Paul give of it. The first states that God spake all the words of the law; the latter states that it was received by the disposition of angels; that it was ordained and spoken by angels.

There can be no doubt that God was the Author and prime Communicator of the law. That he employed angels on mount Sinai on the important occasion of promulgating the law, is abundantly evident. Moses, before his death, blessed the twelve tribes of Israel. In the introduction of his blessing, he says, "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them," Deut. 33:2. The Psalmist, describing the majesty of God, saith, "Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel," Ps. 68:8. "The Lord gave the word; great was the company of them that published it," ver. 11. "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place," ver. 17. From a view of these texts, and from a general view of the subject, it appears that that uncreated Angel, who spake with Moses in mount Sinai, and was repeatedly called Jehovah, was attended with a host of angels on Sinai; and that he employed them as subordinate agents in promulgating the law. But there is no evidence that they personated Jehovah, saying, I am the Lord God.

The Lord, to encourage Moses on his way to the land of promise, says, "Behold I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into

the place, which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him," Ex. 23:20, 21. In this description of the Angel, there are characteristic marks of divinity. It was required to obey his commands, and not to excite his anger; and the reason assigned is, "he will not pardon your transgressions." We are ready to adopt the language of the Jewish doctors of the law, and inquire, "Who can forgive sins but God only?" Forgiveness of sin is the prerogative of him, against whom it is committed. God says of the Angel, whom he sent, "my name is in him." The Angel is called by his name. He is called Lord, God, Jehovah, I AM. The name of a thing is frequently used as synonymous with the thing itself. The *name* of God is often used for God. When Christ prays, "Father, glorify thy name," his request is, that the Father would glorify himself. In many other places in the scriptures the word *name*, is used in the same manner. From this it is inferred, if God's name was in the Angel, God himself was in him. This phraseology, while it conveys an idea of a distinction between God and the Angel, also conveys an idea of a most intimate union; a union, which authorizes the same names to be applied; and the same operations to be attributed to each. The original word, rendered, *in him*, is of greater force than the translation, and expresses the inmost, or most intimate part of any thing; the inner or inmost part of man, his mind, heart, or inmost thought." *Park. Lex.* No word, perhaps, could express a more intimate union between God and the Angel, than this.

This Angel is called "the Angel of his (i. e. God's) presence." He saved Israel. "In his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old," Isaiah 63:9. The name, *Angel of his presence*, or as it may be accurately translated, *Angel of his face*, imports that he manifested the presence of God; that where he was.

there was the face of God. That it was God, who saved and redeemed Israel, is not doubted. But this salvation is attributed to the Angel; and there is no intimation given that he did not do it by his own power.

He is called the messenger, i. e. Angel of the covenant. This name imports that he communicated the covenant; or that he was a contracting party in the covenant; or that he was the leading subject of it. Either of these significations implies that he is the Lord. Besides, he is called the Lord in the same text, in which he is called the Angel of the covenant. See Mal. 3:1.

Three men called on Abraham, in the plains of Mamre, as he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day. They were travelling toward Sodom. Abraham respectfully addressed them; and courteously invited them to stop and take refreshment. In the course of their conversation with this pious man, one appears to be much more eminent than the others. He not only takes the lead in conversation, but he appears to speak with independent authority. When he speaks to Abraham, the sacred historian states that it is the Lord, (יהוה) who speaks to him; and this he does repeatedly. At length "the men turned their faces from thence and went toward Sodom; but Abraham stood yet before the Lord." It appears evident that one of those three men, who appeared to Abraham, was the Lord, who conversed with him. They were called men, because they were in the appearance of men. While they were conversing with the patriarch, without intimation of a new speaker, one in the character of Lord, i. e. Jehovah, addressed him. This one remained with Abraham, while the others went their way. It is evident, or at least, it is in the highest degree probable, that he, who remained, was one of the three. Because, at even, two angels, and two only, are named, went into Sodom to destroy the place.

Divine honors were paid to the Angel of the Lord. Jacob, a short time before his death, commanded that the sons of Joseph should be brought unto him, that he might bless them. When their father presented them before him, "he blessed Joseph and said, *God*, before whom my fathers, Abraham and Isaac did walk, the *God*, which fed me all my life long unto this day, the *Angel*, which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." In this passage there is a supplication to the Angel, as well as to God; and as the verb, *bless*, (in the original) is in the singular number, he made no distinction between them, or rather he addressed them as one, or distributively. Of course, prayer was addressed to the Angel; and it was addressed for a blessing, not verbal, but real, which divine power only could bestow.

"And all the people saw the cloudy pillar stand at the tabernacle door; and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man in his tent door," Ex. 33:10. It cannot be supposed that they paid homage to the pillar of cloud; but to him, that was in it. The scriptures are express, that it was the Angel, who was in the cloud, and guided Israel. It appears therefore, that they worshipped the Angel.

"And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, there stood a man over against him, with his sword drawn in his hand, and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, nay; but as Captain of the host of the Lord, am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship; and said unto him, what saith my Lord unto his servant? And the Captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy; and Joshua did so," Joshua 5:13,14,15. This man, who appeared to Joshua, was undoubtedly the same, that appeared to Jacob and wrestled with him. But after-

ward Jacob said he had seen God face to face. This man is called Captain of the Lord's host. The Israelites were called the host, or the armies of the living God. The Captain, who led this host was the Angel who went with them in the pillar of cloud. If Joshua's falling on his face to the earth and worshipping, do not prove that he gave him divine reverence, the command to loose his shoe from off his foot, because the place where he stood was holy, implies it. When God called to Moses out of the bush, he commanded him to put off his shoes from his feet, because he stood on holy ground. This was commanded as an expression of respect to the divine Majesty. It is presumable that no creature would claim this homage, which God claimed for himself. (Hoc exemplo sacerdotes Judaici calceas exuunt in templo ministrantes. *Pool in loco.*)

In the history of Gideon we find that the Angel of the Lord appeared to him. In the course of the history he is called the Lord. Gideon, unconscious who he was, prepared a present, and offered it to him. The Angel, not needing the sustenance of mortals, appropriated it as a burnt offering. Thus Gideon unwittingly sacrificed unto him; or rather the Angel caused him to make this sacrifice unto himself.

From what has been said respecting the Angel, whose appearances are recorded in the Old Testament, it appears that he was not a created angel, but that he was divine. But it is objected that it is absurd "to suppose that a certain being, may send a messenger on an errand to transact a particular business, and yet be that very messenger, who is sent;" or that God and the Angel of God are the same. However great is this absurdity, we are not answerable for it; for we neither invented, embraced, nor shall we attempt to defend it. But when we find in the inspired writings, that the Angel of God assumes the highest of divine titles, that he performs divine works, and that divine

honors are given to him, we infer that there is a ground of distinction in the divine nature, on which a reciprocal relationship subsists; covenant engagements are ratified; different offices are sustained; and different works are performed. This distinction was perceived by the ancient Jews; but it was more clearly seen under the Gospel.

"Philo makes all the appearances, which we meet with in the books of Moses, to belong to the Word; and the latter Cabalists, since Christ's time, not only do the same, but deny that the Father ever appeared, saying, it was the Λογος only that manifested himself to their fathers, whose proper name is Elohim. He (Philo) expressly affirms of the Angel, that delivered Jacob from all evil, that he was the Λογος. And so does Onkelos in his Chaldee paraphrase, translating the words of Jacob, simply as they lie in the text, without any addition." The Jews after Christ's time retained the same sentiment. (See Allix judgment of the ancient Jewish Church.) When Abraham received the promise that his seed should be as the stars of heaven, it was the word of the Lord, that came unto him, and made him this promise, Gen. 15. As the promise which the word of the Lord made to Abraham is similar to that, which the Angel of the Lord made to Hagar, it is probable that the Word and the Angel are the same. It is evident that the Word was an agent, because he came to Abraham, spake to him; told him that he was his shield, his exceeding great reward. But if the word of the Lord meant no more than his declarations and commands, it seems improper to represent it in this manner.

Besides the appearance of the Angel, who is called Jehovah, who did what divine power only could do; and received, without prohibition, divine honors, there is recorded in the Scriptures, the appearance of many angels. Two angels appeared unto Lot, in Sodom, and brought him out of that corrupt place. But they did not call themselves by divine names; they did not perform divine works; nor did they receive divine

honors. An angel of the Lord appeared to Manoah and his wife; and assured them that they should have a son, who should be a Nazarite unto God. But he refused to accept an offering at their hands; and told them expressly, that if they would offer a burnt offering, they must offer it unto the Lord. This implied that he was not the Lord. David saw an angel with his hand stretched out over Jerusalem to destroy it. But the Lord stayed his hand. This angel bore no marks of divinity. David did not sacrifice to him, but to the Lord. It is recorded in the Scriptures that an angel appeared to Joseph and to Mary, and made known to them important things concerning the child Jesus. Angels ministered unto Christ, when he was upon earth. Two angels were seen in his tomb after he had risen from the dead.

But there are visible marks of distinction, between the appearance of these angels and the appearance of that Angel, who redeemed Israel. The latter gave evidence that he was God, while the former gave equal evidence that they were created beings. Because God employs angels as ministering servants in the affairs of this lower world, it does not follow that the Angel of the covenant belongs to that class of beings. Because they are both called by the name angel, to denote that they are sent, it does not follow, that they possess the same nature; do the same works; or are entitled to the same honors. Each will be viewed and esteemed according to their distinguishing traits of character.

In the New Testament God is more clearly revealed; a distinction in the divine nature is more clearly marked out, and he, who under the Jewish dispensation, occasionally assumed a human *appearance*, under the Gospel dispensation, actually took human nature into union with his own. We find so exact correspondence between Jesus Christ and the Angel of the covenant, who redeemed Israel, that we infer that they are one and the same. It was prophesied by Malachi, "Be-

hold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the *Lord*, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger (or Angel) of the covenant, whom ye delight in," Mal. 3:1. The Evangelists apply this prophecy to Christ and to his precursor. St. Mark, speaking of the Son of God, says, "As it is written in the prophets, behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee." He then adds a prophecy from Isaiah. "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the *Lord*, make his paths straight." The prophet Malachi foretels that a messenger would be sent before the Lord; and the Lord he represents to be even the Angel of the covenant. The Evangelists apply this prediction of the messenger to John the baptist; and the prediction of the Angel of the covenant to Jesus Christ. The conclusion then is, that the Angel and Christ are one and the same.

When God promised to send the Angel before Israel, he said, *my name is in him.* Christ speaks of himself to the same effect. "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that *dwelleth* in me, he doeth the works. Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in in me," John 14:10,11. Of the Angel it was implied that he could forgive sin. Christ actually exercised this power and authority. The apostle Paul expresses the same sentiment, "God was in Christ," 2 Cor. 5:19. The name Emmanuel, signifying *God with us*, which was given to the holy Child of Mary, implied that God was in him. These texts clearly evince that the union of God with Christ is similar to the union of God with the Angel; and such a union between God and any other being, is not exhibited in the sacred scriptures. There is strong evidence therefore, that the Angel and Christ are the same.

The apostle Paul, speaking of the privileges and of the sins of the Israelites in the wilderness, says, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents," 1 Cor. 10:9.

The apostle alludes to the Israelites, when "they journeyed from mount Hor, by the way of the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom; and the soul of the people was much discouraged because of the way; and the people spake against *God*, and against Moses, Wherefore have ye brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness? for there is no bread, neither is there any water," Numb. 21:4,5. The God, against whom they spake, was he, who brought them up out of Egypt; but it was the Angel, who led them from Egypt and guided them in the wilderness; it was the Angel then, whom they tempted. But the apostle Paul gives us to understand that it was Christ, whom they tempted. Therefore the Angel was Christ.

It was the opinion of the ancient Jews, that the Angel, who was called Jehovah, and led and redeemed Israel, was not a created Angel, who personated God. They believed generally that he was the Word. Philo is explicit on this point. "In general, he asserts that it was the Word that appeared to Adam, Jacob and Moses; although in the books of Moses, it is only an Angel that is spoken of. It was the Word, that appeared to Abraham, (Gen. 18:1,) according to Philo; for he saith, it was the Word, that promised Sarah a son in her old age, and that enabled her to conceive and bring forth. It was the Word, that appeared to Abraham as an Angel, and that called to him not to hurt his son, when he was about to sacrifice him. It was the Word that appeared to Hagar. It was the Word that appeared so many times to Jacob, although he be called the Angel that delivered him out of all his trouble. It was the image of God, which in other places is the same with the Word, that appeared to Moses in the bush. It was God that called to him

at the same time, even the Word, whom Moses desired to see. It was the Word, who led Israel through the wilderness, Exod. 33: He was the Angel, in whom God placed his name. This Angel was he, that appeared to Moses, and the elders of Israel on mount Sinai, Exod. 24: It was the Word, whom those Jews rejected that said, "let us make a captain and return into Egypt," Numb. 14:4.

The appearances of the Angel recorded in the Old Testament, were frequently in the form of a man. Once he appeared in a burning bush; once on Sinai in fire and smoke; at other times in a pillar of cloud. These were similitudes, (Numb. 12:8,) or vehicles in which the Angel appeared. But the Israelites did not see the Angel himself. He was a Spirit, and of course, he was not visible. "No man hath seen God at any time. He dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." It appears, that ever since the apostasy, God the Father has holden intercourse with this world, through a Mediator. "There is one God, and *one* Mediator, between God and men, the man, Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. 2:5.

Christ officiated as Mediator between God and man, before his incarnation. He spoke to our first parents in Eden, after they had rebelled; and began to unfold the second, or the new covenant, the covenant of grace. He often spoke to the fathers; and communicated to them the divine will. He was the Angel of the covenant; the Angel, who communicated to this world the covenant of grace. "His goings forth have been from of old; from everlasting," Mic. 5:2.

Christ has employed agents, or subordinate mediators between himself and this fallen world. Moses was a mediator between the Angel and Israel. The priests, who officiated at the altar were mediators between the Lord and the people. But the prime Mediator, the Mediator of the covenant, is the Son of

God. It was through his mediation the saints before the incarnation inherited the promises. They believed in a Savior *to come*, who *would* make an offering for sin once for all; and this faith was accounted to them for righteousness. It was in view, and by virtue of that sacrifice, which he *was* to make, that he made intercession for them, and saved them from their sins.

"No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him," Luke 10:22. This text, while it conveys an idea that the nature of the Son is no less unsearchable by finite intelligence, than the nature of the Father, confirms the sentiment that it is the Son, who, from the beginning, hath revealed the Father. He was in the bosom of the Father, and the Father was in him. He was perfectly acquainted with his nature, and with his counsels. He was, of course, perfectly qualified to declare, or manifest him to the world. Under the former dispensation, his revelations of the divine nature and will, were often seen through shadows and similitudes. He gradually disclosed the perfections and will of the Deity. By types and symbols he prefigured important realities. When the fulness of the time was come, he appeared in the world agreeably to ancient predictions and representations. He more clearly manifested the divine nature. The Deity, who was often exhibited in plurality in the Old Testament, he revealed with these specific distinctions, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Angel, who delivered Israel from temporal evils, and led him to an earthly inheritance, appears in the New Testament a Savior from sin, not a Savior of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. The Spirit, who was represented, just after the creation, hovering over the waters to impregnate them with animal life; and to impress form upon chaos, appears in the New Testament, giving spiritual life to human nature, and restoring order in the moral world. In the Old Testament God is represented, in the relationship of Creator,

as the Father of the whole human race. In the New Testament he is represented as the Father of a spiritual seed; of obedient affectionate children. In the Old Testament he is exhibited in plurality creating the world. In the New, he is represented with the peculiar distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The same Savior, the same Sanctifier were revealed under the former, which were revealed under the latter dispensation, but with less distinctness.

There is an intimate union between God and believers. John, in his first Epistle, says, "If we love one another, God *dwelleth* in us. Hereby know we that we *dwell* in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God *dwelleth* in him and he in God." This union between God and believers is manifestly different from the union, which subsists between God and the Angel, or between the Father and the Son. The Angel, in whom was the name of Jehovah was called by the highest of divine names; he performed divine works; and he received divine honors. There is no intimation that he was dependent. Jesus Christ declares his union with the Father; and for a confirmation of his declaration he appeals to his works. "*What things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.* If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works." From the union, which subsists between the Father and the Son, the same works are attributed indiscriminately to each; and people are required to honor the Son even as they honor the Father. But these consequences do not accrue to believers by reason of their union with God. Their union then is of a different kind; and forms no argument against that higher and more intimate union, which subsists between the Father and the Son.

Those who disbelieve that the Angel of the covenant was the Son of God, are not agreed in their opin-

ions respecting him. Some suppose that he was a created angel; and personated Jehovah. If this be correct, it is hard to draw a line of distinction between the creator and a creature.

Others are of opinion that the Angel of God and Jehovah are equivalent. "Jehovah, the Angel of God, the God of Bethel, God almighty; the redeeming Angel, are all but different names and descriptions of Jehovah the one true God. (See Lindsey.) "It should seem, therefore, that in Scripture language, when describing the divine appearances, the Angel of the Lord appeared, and Jehovah appeared, are equivalent expressions." (Lowman's Tracts, p. 99.) We are ready to admit the judgment of these learned authors as to the *equivalence* of these names. We are ready, also to admit the judgment of other learned authors of the same class, who believe that the Angel and he who sent him are not, in all respects, the same. From both we infer, as we apprehend, the whole truth; that the Angel is *equivalent* to Jehovah, and that there is such a distinction between them, that they are not in every respect the same.

The apostle to the Hebrews contrasts the Mosaic, with the Gospel dispensation, and gives a superiority to the latter. "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things, which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect *so great salvation*, which, at first, began to be spoken by the Lord; and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him," Heb. 2:1,2,3. The apostle attributes greater excellence, and requires a more earnest heed to the Gospel, than to the law of Moses, because the Gospel was spoken immediately by the Lord Jesus, and offered *so great salvation;* whereas the law was spoken by angels; and under that dispensation, "every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense

of reward." The *prime* Communicator of the law, communicated the Gospel. It was the Angel, who spake to Moses in the mount Sinai and with our fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us. This Angel called himself, I AM. This Angel was with the Church in the wilderness and was tempted. The apostle informs us that this Angel, who was tempted in the wilderness, was Christ. If he who gave the law, and he who gave the gospel, are one and the same, it is inquired, why has the Gospel, on this ground, a preference to the law, and what is the force of St. Paul's reasoning. It is readily admitted that angels accompanied the Son of God on mount Sinai, and were subordinate agents in promulgating the law. The commandments which were given from Sinai, and all the revelations which were made under the Jewish economy, were of the same divine authority as the Gospel. But the circumstances were different. The former were communicated *mediately*, the latter was communicated *immediately* by the Son of God. Under the former dispensation he revealed the will of the Father through the medium of prophets. Under the latter dispensation he revealed his will personally. If that dispensation, which was communicated by God through intermediate hands, and whose most prominent retribution was of a temporal nature, demanded attention, more earnest attention does that dispensation demand, which was communicated immediately by the Lord himself, and whose rewards and punishments are of a spiritual nature, and of eternal duration.*

* "Grotius remarks, that the Angel, spoken of in the last text, (Mal. 3:1.) was allowed even by the Jewish Rabbins to be Jehovah, and copies from Masius a striking passage to this purpose, out of the comment of R. Moses, the son of Nehemen, upon the 5th chapter of Joshua. Iste Angelus, &c. i. e. "That Angel, to say the truth, is the Angel Redeemer, of whom it is written, for my name is in him. He was the Angel, who said to Jacob, I am the God of Bethel; and of whom it is said, God called to Moses out of the midst of the bush. He was called an Angel because he governs the world; for it is written, Jehovah (i. e. the Lord God,)brought us out of Egypt. It is moreover written, the Angel of his presence saved them. And, without doubt, the Angel of God's presence was he, of whom it is said, My presence shall go before thee, and I will give thee rest. In a word, He is the Angel, of whom the prophet spake. The Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Angel of the Covenant, whom ye delight in. The face, or presence of God signifies God himself, which is confessedly allowed by all interpreters." (Horæ Solitariæ.)

THE OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENT JEWS, RESPECTING THE SON OF GOD.

It is of no inconsiderable consequence to ascertain the opinion of the Jews, before and after Christ's incarnation, respecting the doctrine of the Trinity. They formed their opinion of the divine nature from the writings of the Old Testament. As they were perfectly acquainted with the idiom of their own language, they were well qualified to determine the meaning of their own Scriptures. It appears that the plural name of God, which is so often used in the Old Testament, naturally conveys an idea of some kind of plurality in the divine nature. The plural names, given to the idols of the heathen, form no valid objection to this hypothesis, when it is considered there were many of the same name.

The writings of Philo the Jew, are very full and explicit on the divine nature. That he wrote some time before the birth of Christ has been clearly proved by a divine of the church of England, in a treatise entitled, "The Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians." In producing testimonies in favor of the Trinity, or of the Divinity of Christ, from the writings of this celebrated Jew, we shall quote them as they are found quoted in this English author.

Philo,* in several places of his writings observes, "That Moses, the law-giver of the Jews, made this his chief end to destroy the notion of polytheism." He then affirms, "that though it is said, God is one, yet this is not to be understood with respect to number." Though this expression is obscure, there is no doubt that he had an idea of purality in unity. He says, "God begets his Word, and his Wisdom, and that his Wisdom is the same with his Word; that this generation was from all eternity; for the Word of God is the *eternal* Son of God." Philo speaks of two powers in God; that these powers made the world, or by them God created the world; that these eternal powers appeared, acted, and spoke as real persons; and in a visible and sensible manner."

"It is clear how sensible the Jews have been that there is a notion of plurality plainly imported in the Hebrew text, since they have forbidden their common people the reading of the history of the creation, lest understanding it literally, it should lead them into heresy. The Talmudists have invented this excuse for the Seventy, as to their changing the Hebrew plural, into a Greek singular; they say it was for fear Ptol. Phil. should take the Jews for polytheists." St. Jerome observes the same.

Since the time of Christ the Jews have retained the opinion that there is a plurality in the divine nature. "Both the authors of the Midrashim and the Cabalistical authors agree exactly in this, that they acknowledge a plurality in the divine essence; and that they reduce such a plurality to three persons as we do. To prove such an assertion, I take notice first, that the Jews do judge as we do, that the word *Elohim*, which is plural, expresses a plurality. Their ordinary remark upon that word is this, that *Elohim*

* The following quotations from ancient Jewish authors are not made with a view to subscribe to *all* their opinions, but simply to shew that they believed there was a plurality in the divine Nature; that the promised Messiah was the Son of God; and that he was divine.

is as if one did read *El hem*, that is, *they are God.* Bachajè, a famous Commentator of the Pentateuch, who brings in his work all the senses of the four sorts of interpreters among the Jews, speaks to this purpose upon the Parascha Breschit. fol. 2. col. 3." Allix. p. 160.

"The author of Zohar is a voucher of great authority; and he cites these words of R. Jose, (a famous Jew of the second century,) when examining the text, Deut. 4:7, *Who have their gods so near to them?* What, saith he, may be the meaning of this? It seems as if Moses should have said, *Who have God so near them?* But saith he, there is a superior God, and there is the God, who was the fear of Isaac, and there is an inferior God; and therefore Moses saith, *the Gods so near.* For there are many virtues, that come from the only One, and all they are one."

"See how the same author supposes that there are three degrees in the Godhead, in Levit. col. 116. Come and see the mystery in the word Elohim, viz. there are three degrees, and every degree is distinct by himself; and notwithstanding they are all One, and tied in one, and one is not, and separated from the other. Upon the words of Deut. 6:4, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord;" they must know that those three are one."

"You have this remark of the same author in Gen. fol. 54, col. 2. de litera, ש that the three branches of that letter denote the heavenly Fathers, who are there named Jehovah, our Lord, Jehovah."

"R. Hay Hagahon, who lived seven hundred years ago, said there are three lights in God; the ancient light, or Kadmon; the pure light, the purified light, and that these make but one God: and that there is neither plurality nor polytheism in this. The same idea is followed by R. Shem Tov."

"If you would know their (i. e. the Cabalists) opinion, to whom it was that God did speak at the creation, Gen. 1:26, R. Juda will tell you God spoke

to his Word. If you would know of them, who is the Spirit of whom we read, Gen. 1:2, *that he moved on the face of the waters*, Moses Botril will inform you, it is the Holy Spirit."

The Chaldee paraphrases are consonant with the opinion of Philo respecting the divine nature. "They ascribe the creation of the world to the Word. They make it the Word that appeared to the ancients under the name of the Angel of the Lord. That Abraham swore by the Word. The Word led Israel in the pillar of a cloud. The Word spake out of the fire at Horeb." The Jews inferred from their Scriptures that the promised Messiah was the Son of God. "Philo in his pieces hath preserved the sense of the ancient Jews in this matter, that this Son was the Λογος, as where he saith, that the Word, by whom they swear was begotten; that God begat his Wisdom according to Solomon, Prov. 8:24, which Wisdom is no other than the Λογος; that the Λογος is the most ancient Son; the eternal Spirit of God; that his Word is his image and his first born; that the Word is the Son of God, before the Angels; that the unity of God is not to be reduced to number; that God is unus, not unicus."

"Nothing can be more express for to prove that there is a Son in the Godhead, than what we read in the Targum of Jerusalem, Gen. 3:22. *The word of Jehovah said, here Adam, whom I created, is the only begotten Son in the world, as I am the only begotten Son in the high Heaven.*" Philo calls the Λογος "the first born of God, the eternal Word of the eternal God, begotten by the Father."

"In Isaiah 4:2, the Messias is called the Branch of the Lord, no doubt as properly as he is called the branch of David, Jer. 23:5. "In that day, saith he, the branch of the Lord shall be beautiful and glorious," which is in Jonathan's paraphrase interpreted of the Messias. From which it is natural to conclude that

the proper Son of God was to be the Messias, and the Messias was to be the proper Son of God."

"The Targum on Jer. 23: acknowledges the Messias to be there treated of, and yet he is called in this place, the Lord of our righteousness. See to the same purpose the Targum on Jer. 33:14. The learned M. Edzardi has proved that the same interpretation of these words of Jeremy, hath continued among the Jews from the time of Jesus Christ, without interruption, till these latter days; and this he hath done from a great number of Jewish authors."

"Philo says that the eternal Word appeared to Abraham. And elsewhere he names that Angel or Word, Jehovah."

"Philo says that it was the Word which appeared to the Jews upon mount Sinai; that God spoke to the Jews when he gave them his laws."

"Philo avows that the Word was the eternal Son of God. He calls him the first born and the Creator of the world."

St. John expresses the same sentiment at the commencement of his Gospel. "In *the beginning* was the Word. All things were made by him and without him was not any thing made that was made." He expresses the same opinion of Christ, which the Jews before him had expressed.

It has been attempted to invalidate the authority of Philo, by saying that he learned his notions of the Trinity from Plato. But the testimony of heathen will remove this objection. "The very heathen authors own that Plato borrowed his notions from Moses, as Numenius, who (as Theodoret tells us) did acknowledge that Plato had learnt in Egypt the doctrine of the Hebrews, during his stay there for thirteen years;" Theod. Serm. 1.

That the ancient Jews believed in a plurality in the divine nature, and in the Divinity of the Messiah, is supported by the Chaldee paraphrases. These paraphrases exhibit the Messias or Word,

in a similar manner to that, which the writers of the New Testament exhibit him. The Jerusalem Targum on Gen. 1:27, says, "The Word of the Lord created man in his own image." When God appeared to our first parents after they had sinned, it is said, "they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the midst of the garden." Philo says that it was the Word of the Lord, that appeared to them. "So both Onkelos and Jonathan have it, that Adam and his wife heard the voice of the Word of the Lord God walking in the garden." The Jerusalem Targum makes use of a similar mode of expression.

"The Angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven, the second time; and said, by myself have I sworn, saith the Lord," &c. "There both Onkelos and Jonathan have it, *By my Word have I sworn, saith the Lord.*" When it is considered, that the ancient Jews believed that the Word was God, they might with propriety say that God swore by his Word; and with equal propriety might the apostle say, that God swore by himself. Many other quotations might be made from the Targums of similar import and of similar application.

But it is objected that there is no weight in the argument drawn from the Targums, because the Hebrew word for God, is often translated or paraphrased in the Chaldee language, the Word of the Lord; that this is the idiom of that language; and that it signifies neither more nor less than God himself. But the Chaldee word Mimra is sometimes used differently and separately by the paraphrasts. "We read in Jonathan's Targum, that Jacob vowed a vow to the *Word*, saying, if the Word of the Lord will be my help, &c. then shall the Lord be my God." In the first part of this quotation, the term Word, or Mimra is used by itself; and it is used as synonymous with Lord. In the same manner does St. John use the word Λογος.

Onkelos on Exodus 29:42, says, "I will appoint my Word to speak with thee there, and I will appoint my Word there for the children of Israel." Here the paraphrast makes a distinction between I and Word; a distinction not unlike that, which Christians make between the Father and the Word. When it is considered, that Philo viewed the Λογος as the promised Messias, it is highly probable that his Hebrew brethren had the same idea of it when they wrote their Targums, notwithstanding all that Prideaux, Louis Capellus, and father Simon have said about the peculiar idiom of the Chaldee language.

Onkelos and Jonathan on Num. 22:9, paraphrase thus, "The Word came from before the Lord, and said." The objection drawn from the idiom of the Chaldee language will not apply to this phraseology. The manner of expression denotes a distinction between the Word and the Lord; and as the critics upon the idiom of the Targums acknowledge that the Word is synonymous with Lord, we have all we contend for. For a further view of this subject, see Allix Judgment of the Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians.

The quotations, which have just been made from ancient Jewish authors are extracted from the works of Allix. "And what advantage do we derive from the labors of others, if we can never confide in them, and occasionally save ourselves some trouble by their means?"*

The Messiah was revealed to the Jews by the name Son. When God speaks of him by that name, he calls him my Son. In the 2d Psalm, God is introduced addressing a certain personage, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Then he commands, saying, "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry." It is generally, if not universally, admitted that this Psalm, or at least, so much of it as describes the Son, is ap-

* Priestley.

plied to the Messiah. If there were any doubt on this point, the apostle to the Hebrews can remove the difficulty; for he quotes this passage in relation to Jesus Christ. In the Acts of the Apostles it is quoted in the same connexion: "I will be his Father and he shall be my Son." If this prophecy had a primary reference to Solomon, its ultimate reference was to Christ; for the apostle Paul quotes it with this reference.

The prophet Isaiah, speaking of the Messiah, saith, "Unto us a Son is given." God, by the prophet Hosea, saith, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt." The prophecy, contained in the latter part of this text undoubtedly relates to Christ; for St. Matthew quotes it in relation to him, and as fulfilled in him.

We learn in the New Testament, what opinion of the Messiah the Jews had formed from these characteristic descriptions. Jesus repeatedly called God his Father. He therefore implicitly called himself his Son. Many times he expressly called himself his Son, his only begotten Son. On a certain occasion Jesus called God his Father in the hearing of the Jews. They were offended; because they understood him by this expression and by claiming this title, to make himself equal with God. (ἴσον τῷ Θεῷ) The word ἴσον literally signifies equal; and it is in vain to attempt to reduce it below this signification. In other places it is translated, and it is correctly translated equal. St. John, describing the city Jerusalem, says, "The length, and the breadth, and the height of it are (ἴσα) equal. There can be no doubt respecting the correctness of the translation of the word in this passage.

But if this word were of doubtful signification, what the Jews said to Christ on another occasion exhibits in a clear light their opinion of the name, Son of God. Jesus said, "I and my Father are one." The Jews accused him of blasphemy *because that he being a man made himself God.* It appears that they had formed their opinion from the prophets that the Messias was

the Son of God; and by their answers to Jesus, it appears that they considered the Son of God to be, or to be equal to, God. Had they believed that Jesus was their expected Messias, they would not have accused him of blasphemy because he called God his Father. During the short time that they believed that he was the Messias, no honors were too great to be bestowed upon him. But when they found that he did not grant them that deliverance which they expected, their opinion changed. They viewed him as a mere man; and of course, a blasphemer, because he pretended to be the Son of God. Adam, Israel, believers, and angels are called sons of God. The Jews understood Christ, claiming a higher relationship to God than these; a relationship, which implied divinity. In answer to the accusing Jews, Christ vindicated himself against the charge of blasphemy upon their own principles, and agreeably to their own Scriptures. If *they* might be called gods, to whom the word of God came, he inferred that he himself, whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world, might, without blasphemy, be called the Son of God. But he referred them to his works for proof of his union with the Father.

When Christ was on trial before the council, the high priest adjured him by the living God, that he should tell them whether he was the Christ, the Son of God. This demand implied that the high priest believed that the promised Christ was the Son of God. His question was, whether Jesus was this personage. When he answered in the affirmative; and told him that he should see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven, the high priest accused him of blasphemy. This representation clearly implies that the high priest believed that the promised Messiah was the Son of God; that the Son of God was divine; that Jesus was blasphemous for pretending to divinity, when he was, in his estimation, a mere man.

THE OPINIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS RESPECTING JESUS CHRIST.

The sacred scriptures contain a perfect system of religion. Their parts correspond and harmonize. Those doctrines, which are most momentous run through the whole sacred volume. They not only cast light upon each other; but they are their own interpreters. The same doctrine, expressed in different ways, exhibited in different points of view, and attended with different circumstances, presents itself with greater clearness, than if it made but a solitary appearance. So fully and clearly are the leading truths of the Gospel expressed, that we need not depend on the creeds of others for articles of our own belief. On the other hand, we ought not to be so self-wise as to refuse a hearing of the opinions and arguments of others. We ought to examine them with impartiality, and bring them, for decision, to the test of God's word.

We feel an anxiety to know the religious sentiments of those eminent Christians, who were cotemporary with the apostles, or succeeded them during a few of the first centuries. We do not look to them for infallibility. But if we look to any, since the apostolic age, for the greatest correctness of sentiment and purity of character, we naturally look to those Christians, who lived nearest to the time of

divine inspiration; who were best acquainted with apostolic example; and whose creeds were tried by fire.

In the first century disputes arose in the church, which required the authority of apostles to decide. It is not surprising that difference of sentiment should early obtain in the church, when it is considered that it was composed of Jews and Gentiles, who had not entirely outgrown their attachment to their former religions; and blended their different systems of philosophy with Christianity. Modern writers are not agreed in opinion, what was then truth, and what was error; or what was orthodoxy, and what was heresy. People of opposite sentiments find something in that early period, which they enlist into the service of their own cause. It is contended that the apostles taught that Christ was merely human; and that a belief of his divinity, and of the doctrine of the Trinity, were innovations in the Christian system. The first, who openly avowed the mere humanity of Christ, are considered by some the legitimate followers of the apostles; and those, who believed his divinity, are considered by them, corrupters of the Christian faith. (See *Priestley's* History of the Corruptions of the Church.)

In the latter part of the first, and in the beginning of the second century, the Gnostics, or Docetæ, and the Ebionites, commanded considerable notice. The Gnostics pretended to restore to mankind a knowledge of the Supreme Being. They derived their origin from blending the oriental philosophy with Christianity. They held that the world was created by one or more evil, or imperfect beings. They denied the divine authority of the books of the Old Testament. They said much in favor of the serpent, who beguiled Eve. They held that evil resided in matter as its centre; and many other things equally repugnant to the inspired writings. When they had so far departed from the simplicity of the Gospel, it cannot be expected that they would entertain very

just notions of Christ. "They denied his Deity, looking upon him as the Son of God, and consequently inferior to the Father; and they rejected his *humanity*, upon the supposition that every thing concrete and corporeal is in itself essentially and intrinsically evil. From hence the greatest part of the Gnostics denied that Christ was clothed with a *real* body, or that he suffered *really*." Some of them subjected themselves to the greatest austerities; but others gave themselves up to almost unbounded licentiousness." (See *Mosheim's* Eccles. His.) It is presumed that none, at the present day, will contend that their sentiments were congenial with those of the apostles; or that they had not corrupted the doctrines of the Gospel. John undoubtedly had this class of Christians in view, when he wrote his first epitsle. "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the *flesh*, is of God. And every spirit, that confesseth *not*, that Jesus Christ is come in the *flesh*, is not of God; and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world," 1 John 4:2,3.

The Ebionites made their first appearance near the close of the first century. These Jewish Christians are thought to have derived their name from their poverty. They disbelieved the miraculous conception of Jesus; but held that he was the son of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary course of nature. They denied his divinity. But what evidence is there that this class of Christians had kept the faith, as it was delivered to the saints? They were members of the church at Jerusalem, which had been planted by the apostles, therefore, it is inferred, they must have retained the doctrines taught by the apostles. This inference is not conclusive, if the premises were correct, because even in the apostle's days, many had departed from sound doctrine; and had imbibed gross opinions of the Gospel. The church of Laodicea had

departed from her first faith before the apostle John had passed off from the stage. Of course, their proximity to the apostles does not *prove* the correctness of their sentiments.

The Ebionites believed that the ceremonial law of Moses was of universal obligation; and that an observance of it was essential to salvation. They held the apostle Paul in abhorrence, and treated his writings with the utmost disrespect. They incorporated with the ceremonial law the superstitions of their ancestors, and the ceremonies and the traditions of the Pharisees. They denied that Christ made a propitiatory sacrifice for sin; and they believed that justification came by the works of the law. (See *Mosheim's* Eccles. His. vol. i, p. 174; and *Milner*, vol. i, p. 138.) Is it to this class of Christians we are to look for sound doctrine? Is it to those, who discarded a considerable part of the New Testament, we are to look for primitive faith; for right sentiments of Jesus Christ? There appears to be as much authority for admitting the correctness of the sentiments of the Gnostics and Docetæ, as for admitting the correctness of those of the Ebionites. Suppose then we admit them both. They counteract each other. One maintains the humanity of Christ; the other denies it. One maintains his derived divinity; the other denies it. Between them both, they deny his existence.

The writings of St. John were evidently levelled against these two denominations of Christians. It is generally admitted that his First Epistle was directed against the Gnostics or Docetæ. He was very particular; and very decisive. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God," 1 John 4: 2,3. These declarations bear also, directly against the Ebionites. The Jews expected that the Messiah was the Christ; that the Christ was the Son of God; and that the Son of God was divine. Andrew said to

his brother, "we have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ." A woman of Samaria said unto Jesus at a certain time, "I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ," John 1:41; and 4:25. Peter, at a certain time, expressed his belief in the most decisive manner. "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," John 6:69. When Jesus was tried before Caiphas, "the high priest, he answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us, whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," Mat. 26:63. In both these texts, Christ and Son of God, are equivalent. When Christ called God his Father, or himself the Son of God, the Jews understood him to make himself God, or equal to God," John 5:18; and 10:33. From this it is evident that it was an opinion among the Jews, that the Christ had existence before he came into the world, and that he was divine. With this in view we easily get the meaning of John, when he applies his observations to the Ebionites, who were Jews. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God." *In the flesh*, expresses the *manner*, in which he came. *Is come in the flesh*, conveys an idea, that he had existence *before* he appeared in this manner.

If Christ had been a mere man, and John had believed him to be no more, it is not probable he would have used this phraseology. That he did consider him to be more than a man, appears evident from the beginning of his epistle. Here he speaks of the Word of life, which he had heard, seen, contemplated on, and handled. In the next verse he calls the Word of life, *the Life*. "For *the Life* was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you *that eternal Life, which was with the Father*, and was manifested unto us." What, or who was the Word of life; that Life; that eternal Life, which was with the Father, which was manifested to the apostles, and of which they testified? It is evident that it was Jesus

Christ. Christ, according to the record which John made of him, called himself *the Life*. But we will let St. John speak for himself. In the beginning of his Gospel he says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. In him was life; and the *Life* was the light of men. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," John 1:1,2,4,14. It appears evident that St. John exhibited the same personage in the beginning of his Epistle, which he exhibited in the beginning of his Gospel; and it is evident that he, whom he introduced in the beginning of his Gospel was Jesus Christ. If St. John designed, by the names, the Word, God, eternal Life, to convey an idea of a mere man, he used these words in an unusual sense. If a belief of the divinity of Christ had been the prevailing heresy of the time, it is not probable that St. John would have endeavored to discountenance this error by applying a divine attribute, a divine name, a divine work to Jesus Christ. It cannot be supposed he would have used this language to establish the mere humanity of Christ.

It is evident that the doctrine of the Ebionites respecting the mere humanity of Christ, was considered heretical by the church in the time of Irenæus, "who wrote his books against heresies in the year 176 or 177. For in the list, which he hath given of heretics, lib. 1, he places the Ebionites between the Cerinthians and Nicolaitans, both of them acknowledged heretics. And in his third book, he refutes by testimonies from the scriptures, the opinion of those, who affirmed that Christ was a mere man, engendered of Joseph; which was precisely the opinion of the proper Ebionites." (*Macknight.*) "It is certain that Gnostics and Ebionites were always looked on as perfectly distinct from the Christian church. There needs no more evidence to prove this than their arrangement by Irenæus and Eusebius under heretical parties." (*Milner.*) If this doctrine was so early considered heretical, it is

not probable that it was a doctrine taught by the apostles. (See *Horseley's* third Sup. Disq.)

In the second century Christianity suffered much by attempts to blend with it the oriental and Egyptian philosophy. Praxeas, a man distinguished for genius and learning, undertook to explain the doctrine of the Trinity, so that it might be understood. "He denied any real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and maintained that the Father, sole Creator of all things, had united to himself the human nature of Christ." (*Mosheim.*) His followers were called Monarchians, and also Patropassians, because they believed, or it was inferred from their belief, that the Father was so intimately united with the man Christ, that he actually suffered with him. But "it does not appear that this sect formed to themselves a separate place of worship, or removed themselves from the ordinary assemblies of Christians." From this circumstance it does not follow that they were sound in faith; or that they were not considered heretics. The orthodox and the heterodox have, more or less, worshipped together from the first century. But this is essentially different from retaining in the bosom of the church those, who had perverted the doctrines of Christianity. Praxeas was persecuted for the sentiments he inculcated respecting the Father, Son and Spirit. If this cast a shade upon the disposition of his opponents, it proves that he was in the minority; and the church esteemed his doctrine heretical. It can hardly be supposed that the church generally, at so early a period, had lost the knowledge of the nature and character of Jesus Christ; and that this knowledge was preserved among those, who denied the Lord Jesus Christ. It is more probable that sound doctrine could, at this early period, be found in the body of the church, than among those individuals and parties, who had blended philosophy with Christianity; and attributed real suffering to the Father. The opinion of Praxeas is not very different from the

opinion of some of modern time. If he, so soon after the apostle's days, was deemed a heretic, it is not surprising that those of similar opinions, at the present day, should be deemed the same.

There is a number of men, who succeeded the apostles, very different in sentiment from the Docetæ, Gnostics, Cerinthians, Ebionites and Patropassians; and much more like the apostles. We should rather look to them for apostolic sentiments.

Clement, bishop of Rome, was for a time cotemporary with the apostle Paul; but survived him a number of years. The apostle makes honorable mention of him; calls him his fellow laborer; and says that his name was in the book of life. Many writings have been attributed to him, of which, it is generally agreed, he was not the author. This circumstance affords evidence that his name was of great weight in the church. One epistle to the Corinthians, bearing his name is considered genuine. In this he expresses much of the sentiment and spirit of the apostles. Speaking of Christ, he says, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Sceptre of the Majesty of God, came not in the pomp of arrogance and pride; though who can understand the thunder of his power? But he was meek and lowly." *The Sceptre of the Majesty* when applied to Christ conveys an idea of his authority and government; and it appears to be parallel with what Christ said of himself after his resurrection. "All power (i. e. authority) is given unto me in heaven and in earth." To be the *Sceptre* of God's Majesty; to possess all authority in heaven and in earth, conveys an idea of divine authority. If it was delegated, it appears that the recipient must be divine; or he would not be capable of performing its functions. "Who can understand the thunder of his power?" This sublime language, which he applied to Christ, he borrowed from Job, who applied it to God in his description of his Power and Majesty. In this he imitated the apostles, who applied to Christ what had been

in the Old Testament, applied to God. After Clement had thus spoken of the divine dignity and glory of the Savior, he adds, "he was meek and lowly." In this manner, he imitated the apostles by exhibiting the Lord Jesus in his divine and human nature; as the Sceptre of God's Majesty; and as occupying the low condition of humanity.

Again Clement speaks of Christ, "Have we not all one God, one Christ, one Spirit of grace poured upon us, and one calling in Christ?"—"Through him, that is Jesus Christ, let us behold the glory of God shining in his face." This language appears much like that of the apostles; and if their's were not explained away, it appears that this would naturally give us an idea of Christ's divinity. When the dispute ran high, whether Christ was merely divine, or merely human, it appears that Clement, who was well acquainted with the apostle's opinion on this subject, if he had believed the simple humanity of Jesus, would not have spoken of him in language, which was appropriate to God.

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, suffered martyrdom in the year 107. He was a disciple of St. John; and was, undoubtedly, acquainted with his sentiments of Jesus Christ. When he was questioned by Trajan respecting his religion, among other things he said, "There is only one God, who made heaven, and earth, the sea and all that is in them; and one Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, whose kingdom be my portion." By the name *only begotten Son*, he undoubtedly meant what Christ meant, when he called himself the Son of God; what Peter meant, when he called him the Son of the living God; what the high priest meant when he adjured him to tell them whether he was the Christ, the Son of God. It is evident that by Son of God, the Jews understood God, or equality with God. It is probable he used the name Son of God in its popular sense.

Ignatius, in his salutation to the Church at Ephesus, calls them "elect in the genuine suffering, by the will

of the Father, and of Jesus Christ our God," &c. It is not surprising, that he should imitate the apostle, whose disciple he was; and call his Master God; and by this name mean the same, which he meant.

"One Physician there is, bodily and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God appearing in flesh, in immortal, true life, both from Mary and from God, first suffering then impassible." This language appears to be plain. It naturally conveys an idea of two natures in the Physician Jesus Christ; that one nature was literally begotten; that the other nature was not thus begotten; that divine nature appeared in humanity; that the one was from Mary, the other from God; that one was capable of suffering, and the other was not. It is worthy of notice, that Ignatius called this Physician God appearing in flesh; and also *from* God. If God without distinction in his nature dwelt in the man Christ Jesus, there appears to be an incongruity in saying that God was *from* God. He states that this Physician is both from Mary and from God. That he was from Mary in his human nature, is not disputed. But in what sense was he *from* God? Is it in no other sense than he was *sent* from God as John was sent? Suppose this to be the meaning. Suppose Christ to be a mere man, as was his forerunner. In what sense then was he unbegotten; in what sense was he God appearing in flesh; in what sense was he impassible? It is difficult to explain away all the parts of this passage of Ignatius by any *one* rule; or by different rules, which will not clash.

Ignatius, endeavoring to bring off, or preserve the Ephesians from Judaism, observes, "The divine prophets lived according to Jesus Christ. For this they were persecuted, being inspired by his grace to assure the disobedient that there is one God, who manifested himself by Jesus Christ his Son, who is his eternal Word.—But live according to the life of the Lord, in which also our Life rose again by himself.—That you may be well assured of the nativity, suffer-

ing and resurrection, during the government of Pontius Pilate, of which literally and really, Jesus Christ was the subject." This language, which he applied to Christ, bears a strong resemblance of the language of St. John. They both call Jesus Christ Son of God. They both call him the Word. Ignatius calls him *eternal* Word. They both call him Life. St. John calls him "that *eternal* Life." They both attribute to him eternity. This attribute cannot, with propriety, be applied to a mere creature, or to a *derived* being.

Ignatius, in view of his death speaks of Christ thus: "He is my gain laid up for me, suffer me to imitate the passion of my God." In a preceding quotation he represented Christ first suffering, then *impassible.* In this quotation he calls him God, and in this name attributes to him sufferings. He did not, probably, design to convey an idea that divine nature suffered. He had declared the contrary. In consequence of the intimate union of human and divine nature in Jesus Christ, he called him God, without making a distinction of natures; and without this distinction he attributed suffering to him. This is agreeable to our manner of speaking concerning man. We say he is mortal; whereas his better part is immortal. The phraseology of Ignatius clearly conveys an idea of two natures in Jesus Christ.

Again he speaks of the Savior. "I glorify Jesus Christ, our God, who hath given you wisdom. For I understand that you are perfect in the immovable faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, who *really* was of the seed of David according to the flesh; born of the virgin *really;* who *really* suffered under Pontius Pilate. Consider the times, and expect him, who is above all time, who is unconnected with time, the invisible One, made visible for us, the impassible, but passible for us; who bore all sorts of sufferings for us." When Ignatius was led to execution, "He prayed to the Son

of God in behalf of the churches, that he would put a stop to the persecution." (*Milner.*)

If we consider the time, in which Ignatius lived, his writings will appear with greater perspicuity and pertinence. The Docetæ and Ebionites had gained ground, and were prevailing. He wished to discountenance these sects, and he directed his observations against them. When he said that Christ was *really* of the seed of David, was born of the virgin *really*, and *really* suffered under Pontius Pilate, he repelled the sentiment of the Docetæ, who held that Christ was not *really* human, but had only the *appearance* of a man. When he called him impassible, unconnected with time, eternal Word and God, he repelled the sentiment of the Ebionites, who believed that Christ was merely human. Had Ignatius been of this opinion, and designed to discountenance the belief that Christ was divine, it is incredible that he should call him impassible, eternal, and even call him God. This language would be directly opposite to his design. But if he believed that Christ was both human and divine, his language appears to be appropriate. He sets forth both natures in language, which is adapted to both. When it is considered that Ignatius was the disciple of John; that his language and sentiment bore a striking resemblance of, and coincidence with, the language and sentiment of that apostle, the testimony of this Christian father appears with great authority. After he had given such a representation of Christ, he appears consistent with himself, when, at the close of life, he directs his prayer to him in behalf of the church.*

Justin Martyr bore testimony, in a clear and decisive manner, to the divinity of Jesus Christ. He was "a man of eminent piety and considerable learning, who from a pagan philosopher, became a Christian martyr. He had frequented all the different sects of philoso-

* Concerning the genuineness and authenticity of Ignatius' epistles, see Horseley's Letters to Priestley.

phy in an ardent and impartial pursuit of truth, and finding neither among stoics nor Peripatetics, neither in the Pythagorean, nor Platonic schools, any satisfactory account of the perfections of the Supreme Being, and the nature and destination of the human soul, he embraced Christianity on account of the light which it cast upon these interesting subjects."

This Christian philosopher expressed his belief in the following manner, when he was arraigned before an officer and questioned respecting his religion. "We believe the one only God, to be the Creator of all things, visible and invisible, and confess our Lord Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, foretold by the prophets of old, and who shall hereafter appear the Judge of mankind, a Savior, teacher, and master to all those, who are duly instructed by him. As for myself I am too mean to be able to say any thing becoming his infinite Deity. This was the business of the prophets, who ages ago had foretold the coming of the Son of God into the world." In this quotation, Justin makes a distinction between God and the Son of God. But he attributes to him unqualified divinity, viz. "*infinite Deity.*" He understood the prophets to prophesy of Christ, possessing infinite Deity. He appeared to agree with the Jews in this particular, that by the name, Son of God, was to be understood God, or one equal with God.

In his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, this enemy of Christianity charges him with paradox and foolishness. Justin takes him on his own ground, and shews that if Christ's divinity could not be demonstrated, he ought to be acknowledged the Christ of God, on account of the exact correspondence between his character and the Messiah, predicted by the prophets.

"In another part of the same dialogue, (p. 56,) he speaks of Christ as the God of Israel, who was with Moses, and shews what he meant when he said that true Christians regarded what they were taught by the prophets. In his First Apology, he tells the

emperor in what sense the Christians were atheists, they did not worship the gods commonly so called, but they (p. 137) worshipped and adored the true God and his Son, and the prophetic spirit, honoring them in word and in truth." This quotation needs no comment. It is plain, and expressive of the sentiment which he entertained of the Son and Spirit.

Justin suffered martyrdom about the year 163. He appears to have imbibed the sentiments of the apostles respecting the Son and Spirit. He appears to be clear in his belief of their distinction and divinity. His sentiments of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, are of no inconsiderable weight. He was a man of learning. He appeared to be an impartial inquirer after truth. He evinced his sincerity by suffering death for the cause of Christ.

Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, suffered martyrdom, A. D. 167. "The apostles, and we may apprehend St. John particularly, ordained him to this office. He had been familiarly conversant with the apostles, and received the government of the church from those who had been eye witnesses and ministers of our Lord, and continually taught that which he had been taught by them."* It does not appear that he sought the honor of martyrdom. But when he was brought to execution he suffered death with Christian fortitude.

When he was bound, and the preparations were made for burning him, he addressed the following prayer to God. "O Father of thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have attained the knowledge of thee, O God of angels and principalities, and of all creation, and of all the just, who live in thy sight, I bless thee that thou hast counted me worthy of this day, and this hour, to receive my portion in the number of martyrs, in the cup of Christ, for the resurrection to eternal life, both of soul and body, in the incorruption of the Holy Ghost, among whom may

* Milner's Church History, vol. i, p. 176, *Boston edition.*

I be received before thee this day as a sacrifice well savored, and acceptable, as thou the faithful and true God hast prepared, declaring beforehand, and fulfilling accordingly. Wherefore I praise thee for all those things, I bless thee, I glorify thee, by the eternal High Priest, Jesus Christ, thy well beloved Son; through whom with him in the Holy Spirit, be glory to thee, both now and for ever. Amen." This prayer is expressed in language truly apostolical. The martyr addressed the Father through his beloved and blessed Son. In connexion with him he named the Holy Spirit. He called Jesus Christ the *eternal* High Priest. There is nothing in his language, which appears to be directed particularly against any prevailing error. It appears to be truly devotional. Whoever would gather the doctrine of the Trinity from the language of the apostles, would undoubtedly perceive it in his.

The church of Smyrna wrote a letter to the church of Philomelium concerning the character and death of Polycarp. Speaking of Jesus Christ, they said, "that it is not possible for us to forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all, who are saved of the human race, nor ever to *worship* any other. For we *adore* him as being the Son of God." This sentiment expressed by a church, appears to be of no inconsiderable weight, when it is considered what honorable mention was made of it by Christ to his servant John. "I know thy works and tribulation and poverty, *but thou art rich.*"

Melito, bishop of Sardis, belongs to the second century. Speaking of the Christians, he says, "the Christians do not adore insensible stones, but that they worship one God alone, who is before all things, and in all things, and Jesus Christ, who is God before all ages." Milner makes the following quotation from Eusebius. "Who knoweth not that the works of Irenæus, Melito, and all other Christians, do confess Christ to be both God and man. In fine, how many

psalms and hymns, and canticles were from the beginning by faithful Christians, which celebrate Christ, the Word of God, as no other than God indeed?"

Irenæus lived in the latter part of the second, and in the beginning of the third century. He suffered martyrdom under Septimius Severus. Speaking of tradition, he said, "It is what several barbarous nations observe, who believe in Jesus without paper or ink, having the doctrine of salvation written on their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and faithfully keeping up to ancient tradition concerning one God, the Creator, and his Son Jesus Christ."

Speaking of Christ, Irenæus observed, "He united man to God; for if man had not overcome the adversary of man, the enemy could not have been legally conquered. And again, if God had not granted salvation, we should not have been put in firm possession of it, and if man had not been united to God, he could not have been made partaker of immortality. It behoved then the Mediator between God and man, by his affinity with both, to bring both into agreement with each other. The Word of God, Jesus Christ, on account of his immense love, became what we are, that he might make us what he is." In these quotations Irenæus has declared his belief that the Son of God, or the Word of God, is Jesus Christ; and that he partakes of human and divine nature.

The book, entitled *the Epistle of St. Barnabas*, though not the composition of the apostle Barnabas, is allowed to have been written in the apostolic age. "The Lord," says Barnabas, "submitted to suffer for our soul, although he be the Lord of the whole earth, unto whom he said the day before the world was finished, "Let us make man after our image, and our likeness." Again,—"for if he had not come in the flesh, how could we mortals seeing him have been preserved, when they, who behold the sun, which is to perish, and is the work of his hands, are unable to

look directly against its rays." Again,—"if then the Son of God being Lord, and being to judge the quick and dead, suffered to the end that his wound might make us alive; let us believe that the Son of God had no power to suffer, had it not been for us." And again,—"Meanwhile thou hast [the whole doctrine] concerning the majesty of Christ, how all things were made for him and through him; to whom be honor, power, and glory, now and for ever." There is evidence from his writings, that he was a Hebrew Christian. He did not labor to prove the divinity of Christ, as he probably would have done, had those to whom he wrote, disbelieved it; but he made his assertions, as if his sentiments of Christ were generally received by Jewish converts, and would not be disputed. (See *Horseley's* eighth Letter to *Priestley.*)

Tertullian lived in the second and third century. He wrote against Praxeas. He observes on the subject of the Trinity, "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet one God." Milner represents him in the following manner. "He speaks of the Lord Jesus, as both God and man, Son of man, and Son of God, and called Jesus Christ. He speaks also of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the Sanctifier of the faith of those who believe in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. He observes that this rule of faith had obtained from the beginning of the Gospel, antecedent to any former heretics, much more to Praxeas, who was of yesterday." If this be a fair representation of his ideas, he was clear and decisive in his belief of the Trinity. If he was, in some respects, unsound in the faith, this would not invalidate his testimony respecting the rule of faith, which had obtained from the beginning of the gospel; nor would it prove him to be incorrect respecting the doctrine of the Trinity.

Clemens Alexandrinus was cotemporary with Irenæus and Tertullian. Contrasting the authors of idolatry with Christ, he observes, "Whereas Jesus Christ, who from all eternity was the Word of God,

always had a compassionate tenderness for men, and at last took their nature upon him, to free them from the slavery of demons, to open the eyes of the blind, and the ears of the deaf, to guide their paths in the way of righteousness, to deliver them from death and hell, and to bestow on them everlasting life, and to put them into a capacity of living an heavenly life here upon earth; and lastly, that God made himself man to teach man to be like unto God.—Believe, therefore, in one God, who is God and man, and receive eternal salvation for a recompense."

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, was distinguished for his natural abilities, for his eloquence, for his fervent piety, and for his exertions to promote the cause of Christ. He suffered martyrdom in the third century. In his writings, he expresses his sentiments respecting Jesus Christ. In one of his letters, he writes thus, "How shameful must it be for a Christian to be unwilling to suffer, when the Master suffered first; and that we should be unwilling to suffer for our sins, when he who had no sin of his own, suffered for us. The Son of God suffered that he might make us the sons of God." In this quotation, he calls Christ by the scriptural names, Master, and Son of God. If his use of these names do not prove what were his particular sentiments of Christ's nature and character, what he said of his sufferings carries evidence that he believed that his death was an expiatory sacrifice.

Again this Christian father remarks, "What glory! what joy! to be admitted to see God, to be honored, to partake of the joy of eternal light and salvation with Christ the Lord your God." Again he gives the same divine name to Christ. "We ought not by a long delay and neglect, to suffer the temples of God to remain in captivity, but to labor with all our might and quickly to shew our obsequiousness to Christ our Judge, *our Lord and our God.*"

Cyprian, a little before his execution, being interrogated and threatened by the proconsul, replied,

"My safety and virtue is Christ the Lord, whom I desire to serve for ever." In these quotations he viewed Christ as a sacrifice for sin; he called him our Lord and our God; and he expressed a desire to serve him for ever. If he believed Christ's divinity, he was consistent in making these expressions.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, expressed his ideas on the doctrine of the Trinity with clearness and decision. "The Father, (says he) cannot be separated from the Son, as he is the Father; for that name at the same time establishes the relation. Neither can the Son be separated from the Father, for the word Father implies the union; and the Spirit is in their hands, because it cannot exist without him, who sends it to him who bears it. Thus we understand the indivisible Unity of the Trinity; and we comprehend the Trinity in the Unity without any diminution."

It is not foreign to our purpose to introduce here Paul of Samosata, who was bishop of Antioch. He taught that Christ "was by nature a common man as we are." In consequence of this sentiment, and of the irregularities of his life, a large council was called at Antioch. He "was induced to recant, and gave such appearances of sincerity, that Firmilian and the council believed him;" and he was suffered to retain his bishopric. His dissimulation did not remain long concealed. After a few years another council, consisting of seventy bishops, was convened. "The ambiguous Paul" at this time disclosed his sentiments respecting Christ. "All the bishops agreed to his deposition and exclusion from the Christian church." This decision was made in the year 269; and it proves that a disbelief of the divinity of Christ was not the prevailing opinion of that time; and that it was discountenanced by the Christian church.

Felix was the successor of Dionysius of Rome. He wrote a letter to Maximus of Alexandria, 'in which he speaks thus, probably on account of Paul's heresy.' "We believe that our Savior Jesus Christ was born of

the virgin Mary; we believe that he himself is the eternal God, and the Word, and not a man whom God hath taken into himself, so as that man should be distinct from him: for the Son of God being perfect, God was also made perfect man, being incarnate of the virgin."

Origin flourished in the third century. He was acknowledged to be a man of ability, learning, piety and indefatigable in his labors. Trinitarians and Unitarians, both have claimed him. Sometimes he expressed his ideas concerning the Father, Son, and Spirit in language, which entitled him to the ranks of Trinitarians. At other times his language naturally imported that he was a Unitarian. It is not necessary to contend about his sentiments. On whichever side he may stand, his opinion will not affect the question. If he believed a plurality in the divine nature he will add only one to the long list of fathers, who for three centuries believed the same. If he held only to an allegorical Trinity, as some contend that he did, he was one of those, who appeared to adhere more closely to his system of philosophy than to express declarations of scripture. In whichever scale he falls, his weight will be less than if he had been generally correct in his views of the other parts of Christianity. Speaking of Origen, Mosheim says, "I would not believe this witness upon his oath, vending as he manifestly does, such flimsy lies."

This is a brief view of the opinions of the most distinguished fathers of the three first centuries concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, especially concerning the nature and character of Jesus Christ. It appears by their language that they believed he was divine; and that they and the church considered those heretical, who denied his divinity. This appears to be the testimony of the friends of Christianity. Let us attend to the testimony of some of its early enemies, so that by the mouth of both witnesses the subject may be well established.

Pliny, it is well known, was a bitter enemy of the Christians. In his letter to Trajan, early in the second century, he writes thus: "And this was the account, which they gave me of the nature of the religion they once had professed, whether it deserves the name of crime or error, *that they were accustomed on a certain day to meet before day light, and to repeat among themselves an hymn to Christ, as to a God*, and to bind themselves by an oath with an obligation of not committing any wickedness," &c. This account of the practice of Christians was given to Pliny by some apostate Christians. This account clearly shews that the Christians of that time tendered divine honors to Jesus Christ. Their credibility is not invalidated by their being apostates. They had been with the Christians. They knew their practice; and it appears they would have no temptation to make a false statement on this point.

Lucian, another enemy of Christianity, belongs to the second century. He was remarkable for his sarcasm. In his account of Peregrinus he speaks thus of Christians: "However, these people *adore* that great Person, who had been crucified in Palestine, as being the first who taught men that religion.—Since they separated from us, they persevere in rejecting the gods of the Grecians, and *worshipping* that deceiver, who was crucified." This is another evidence that Christians in the second century gave divine honors to Jesus Christ.

Celsus wrote near the close of the second century. Infidelity never, perhaps, appeared with greater malignity than in this man. A few quotations from him will shew what was then understood by Christians that Christ pretended to be, and what they understood that he really was. "Christ was privately educated, and served for hire in Egypt; got acquainted with miraculous arts there, returned, and for those miracles, *declared himself God.* Why should you, when an infant, be carried into Egypt, lest you should be mur-

dered? God should not fear being put to death. You say that God was sent to sinners, &c. He had no reason to fear any mortal now, after he died, and as you say he was a God." These quotations prove that Christians in the latter part of the second century believed that Christ made himself God; and that they also believed that he was God.

The testimony of Porphyry is similar to that of Celsus. He wrote in the third century. "Men wonder now, (said he) that distempers have seized the city so many years, Æsculapius and the other gods no longer dwelling among them; for since *Jesus was honored*, no one has received any public benefit from the gods." Porphyry tells the following story: "A person asked Apollo how to make his wife relinquish Christianity? It is easier perhaps, replied the oracle, to write on water, or to fly into the air, than to reclaim her. Leave her in her folly to hymn in a faint mournful voice the *dead God*, who publicly suffered death from judges of singular wisdom."

ON THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST.

"The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," Isaiah 53:6. It is important to know the design and effects of the sufferings of Jesus Christ. Though the Scriptures appear to be full and explicit on this subject, there is no inconsiderable difference of opinion respecting it. The doctrine of the atonement is of the first importance, whether it be viewed in relation to the moral condition of man, or in relation to the nature and character of the Lord Jesus.

The Creator made mankind moral agents, and he gave them a law for the regulation of their conduct. This law required perfect obedience; and it threatened punishment for every transgression. Whatever may be the difference, in respect to the number of God's commands in different ages of the world, they are of one nature; they require obedience, and they threaten punishment for every offence. If, in one age of the world, the penalty of the law was everlasting punishment, it was the same in every age.

We look over this world, and we find that it is a province of divine government; and that it is a rebellious province. They have violated the law of their divine Sovereign; forfeited the reward of righteousness; and incurred the penal consequences of transgression. If the law have its natural course, the threatened punishment will be inflicted upon every transgressor; and the whole race of man will suffer the vengeance of God for ever. If the divine law be

just and good, its honor would be supported in this way by its own provisions. But we learn from the general dealings of God with this world, and from his revealed word, that mercy is an attribute of his nature; that he is benevolent to sinful man; that he delighteth not in the death of sinners. A question naturally rises here; how can God exercise both justice and mercy in relation to the same subjects of his government? If they be entirely obedient, justice gives them the rewards of righteousness. If they transgress, justice consigns them to the threatened penalty. In either case there is no *mercy*. The holy and the rebellious angels are both under the influence of the *justice* of God.

When the Creator saw human nature, the workmanship of his hand, despoiled of its moral excellence, he was disposed to shew mercy, to bestow favor. But how this could be done consistently with the claims of justice, and with the validity of the divine law, could not, probably, be discovered by the greatest efforts of created intelligence. If pardon were conferred upon every transgressor, without any consideration, the law would have no force; it would impose no restraint; it would be merely advisory, but not authoritative. Subjects would yield to every impulse of their base passions, having no ground to fear any pernicious consequences. If part were pardoned without any consideration, it would proportionately diminish the force of the divine law. Every one would hope that he might belong to the favored number, and much restraint from transgression would be taken off. In either case sin would not appear very heinous; nor would it appear to be very offensive to God. The divine government would not appear with great majesty in the sight of men. Sin would abound much more than it does at present; and this would not be calculated to prepare subjects for the holy services and enjoyments of the heavenly state.

If God should forgive sinners on the ground of their suffering a certain term of punishment, it would be on the principle of justice or mercy. If it were on the principle of justice, it would follow that as sin deserved but a limited punishment, it was a finite evil. This view of it would comparatively diminish its guilt, and it would diminish the dignity of the divine character and government, against which it was committed. If God should abate his threatened punishment, either in degree, or in duration, on the ground of mercy, he would manifest, comparatively, less abhorrence of sin; he would diminish the dignity of his character and the efficacy of his law and authority. If sin be an infinite evil and deserves a proportionate punishment, a point in duration will never arrive, in which the transgressor can claim exemption from further suffering.

By some it is maintained that repentance is the ground, on which pardon is bestowed upon the guilty. It is admitted, that under the present economy of divine government, sin is forgiven on the condition of the repentance of the transgressor. But repentance is not the procuring cause of his forgiveness. The divine law requires perfect obedience; and it declares that "cursed is every one, who continueth not in all things, which are written in the book of the law to do them." It makes no abatement of its requisitions; and it makes no provision for exemption from its penalty on any condition whatever. If a transgressor repents, his act of penitence comes not within its scope. Sorrow for sin makes no satisfaction to the violated law. It makes no remuneration to the one offended, or injured. Were transgressors pardoned solely on the ground of their repentance, the requisitions of the law would be diminished; its authority and efficacy would be weakened, and proportionate encouragement would be given to transgression. But it has been maintained that it might be reasonably expected that God would forgive on the ground of

repentance; and that this has been a prevailing sentiment of the nations of the earth. But this is not fact. This conclusion would not be made from any analogy whatever. The civil law does not grant pardon to a culprit in consequence of his repentance. It requires that the penalty be inflicted; so that no one should be encouraged to transgress. If a man be injured by his fellow creature in his person, property or character, will he be satisfied merely with the repentance of the offender? Will he not require an equivalent for the damages, which he has sustained? A restitution of property unjustly taken, and eye for eye, tooth for tooth, and blood for blood, were part of the divine law, which was established on principles of strict justice. Remuneration for injuries, when it is practicable has always been considered a prerequisite for acceptance of repentance. As mankind could make no recompense to the divine Sovereign for the offences they had offered him, they could not infer that their repentance would secure them the forgiveness of their God. It is a well known fact, that heathen nations generally, if not universally, have adopted the expedient of sacrifices to appease their offended deities; which they would not have done, had they believed that repentance only would have rendered them propitious. The more dear to them were the victims, which they offered, the more pleasing, they imagined, would be their sacrifices to their incensed deities. From this arose the practice of offering human victims. Some offered the fruit of their bodies for the sins of their souls. Whether the practice of sacrifice was an invention of the human mind in the darkness of paganism, or whether it was handed down by tradition from the first ages, it is certain, that mankind generally have embraced the sentiment, that something beside repentance was necessary to make satisfaction for sin.

Nothing occurs under the Providence of God, which warrants a belief that repentance will be followed by

forgiveness. But we witness many things, which would naturally lead us to a different conclusion. "For when men ruin their fortunes by extravagance, or their health by excess in sensual indulgences, it is well known that repentance alone doth not remove these evil consequences of their follies and excesses. Wherefore, if in the present life, repentance is never found of itself to remove the temporal evil consequences, which God hath connected with vice; also, if men themselves being judges, repentance ought not to prevent the punishment of crimes injurious to society, what reason hath any person, from the constitution of things, to expect that repentance of itself will prevent those penal consequences, which God may have thought fit to annex to vice in the life to come. Much more, what reason hath any one, from the present constitution of things, to expect that repentance and reformation will put the sinner into the condition, he would have been in, if he had always preserved his innocence."*

It appears evident that a transgressor cannot do any thing, which will make satisfaction to the divine law, but suffering its penalty. If he repent and reform, and from the present time render a perfect obedience to the divine precepts, he does nothing to cancel the demands, which stand against him for past transgression. Present obedience is but present duty. It cannot have a retrospective influence. If one, for any given time, could do more than his duty for that time, he might acquire a surplus of righteousness, which would counterbalance transgressions, and supply past deficiencies. But this method is alike contrarient to reason and to revelation. It requires no arguments to prove that if a transgressor cannot save himself from the penal consequences of sin, he cannot save others. Should a created being, of any grade whatever on the scale of creation undertake in his behalf, what would be the consequence? However

* Macknight.

great his capacity, or his benevolence might be, his own obligations to his Creator, should be proportionate to his degrees of ability. It would be required of him, on his own account, according to what he had. Suppose he should volunteer his services in behalf of this sinful world; that he should suffer in their stead. If he were under obligation to his Creator to make this sacrifice, he would perform only his own duty; he would acquire no surplus of merit, which he could transfer to the necessitous. If he were not under obligation to make this sacrifice, there is no evidence that he would have a right to do it; and if he had, there is no evidence that the divine Sovereign would accept it in behalf of his rebellious subjects. There is no evidence that it would be equivalent, in the sight of the law, to the penalty, which it had threatened.

If God design to shew mercy by forbearing to inflict the threatened penalty on transgressors, it appears to be necessary that something should be done or suffered, which would as fully support the divine character, and render the divine law as efficacious, as if it had its natural course, and subjected every offender to its curse. Were any thing less than this substituted, God's abhorrence of sin would appear to be diminished; transgression would be encouraged; and the law, of course, would cease to produce its full and designed effect. How then can rebellious subjects be forgiven, and divine authority be supported? We are wholly indebted to divine revelation for an answer to this question. We are taught by the sacred scriptures that there is in the divine Nature a plurality, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that they are manifested in the work of redemption; that in respect to office the Father holds authority, and the Son and Holy Spirit are subordinate; that this method is adopted by consent, and without infringement upon the divine prerogatives of either. In the covenant of redemption it was stipulated that the Son should have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of

the earth for his possession; that he should see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; and that he should be King in Zion. The Son, in view of what he had to do, and of what he was to receive, said, "Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God." Ever since the apostasy, the Son has been the medium of intercourse between the Father and the human race; and between the human race and the Father. He has ever been the medium, through which every blessing has been conferred upon this fallen world. When the fulness of the time (the time marked out by prophecy) was come, the Son of God laid aside, concealed, or emptied himself of that glory, which he had with the Father, was born of a woman; was made flesh, and took upon him the form a servant. He was *rich*, as Creator and Proprietor of the world; he was *rich* in respect to his divine glory in heaven; but for the sake of a sinful world he became *poor;* he assumed a condition of poverty, not having where to lay his head; he subjected himself to a state of humiliation. From this scriptural representation we see what the Son of God did on the part of Divinity for the support of the divine law, while pardon was offered to sinners on merciful conditions. In this state of abasement the divine Son was exposed to the greatest indignity; and he actually received the grossest insults, and the most contemptuous treatment during his public ministry on earth. In the exercise of divine benevolence he came into the world to seek and to save that which was lost. He came to his *own*, the people, who had been the objects of his special care, support, and direction. He addressed them in the most affectionate language. He offered them the greatest of blessings, salvation, on condition of faith in his name. He appealed to his works, his divine works, to prove his benevolent designs, that he was the Son of God; and that he was *able* to bestow what he had offered. But they returned him ingratitude and abuse. They not only refused the offers of his mercy; but they were inveterate

against him. In his works of love they accused him of confederacy with Beelzebub. When it was proposed to them whether they would give preference to him, or to a vile malefactor, they with one consent gave their voice in favor of the latter. All this ignominy and abasement were endured by the divine Son.

In union with him was the Son of man, whose nativity was miraculous; whose life was holy, harmless, undefiled; who received the Spirit without measure, and was anointed with the Holy Ghost, and with power. So intimate was the union of the Son of God with the man, Christ Jesus, that the sufferings of the latter upon the cross were a sacrifice of vastly more importance than the sufferings of any other man. The spotless purity of his nature, the perfection of his character, the extraordinary unction of the Holy Spirit, which he received, and his union with the Son of God, rendered him peculiarly dear to the Father. Here we have at one view the constituent parts of the atonement, viz. *the humiliation of the Son of God, and the sufferings of the Son of man.* These parts ought to be viewed so far distinctly, that their different values may appear; and they ought to be viewed so far unitedly, as they are the acts, or sufferings of one and the same Mediator. If the Son of God *humbled* himself by union with the Son of man, the Son of man was exalted by the same union; and there arose a reciprocal influence from this mysterious connexion. We must cautiously avoid any hypothesis, or language, which seems to blend or confound the two natures of Jesus Christ; which seems to attribute a suffering of painful sensations to his divinity, or a communication of divine properties to his humanity. When it is represented that the *Word* was made *flesh*, that the *second Adam* was the *Lord* from heaven, that *he*, who expired upon the cross was the *Lord of glory*, that the *Son of man* would ascend up where he was *before*, we are not to understand that divinity was

converted into humanity, or that humanity was converted into divinity; or that either nature sustained the least degree of change. But this manner of expression conveys the idea of the intimate connexion of his two natures; and during his incarnate state, the mention of one involves the other, and by implication, the same things may be predicated of each. The Scriptures use the same mode of expression, in relation to the material and immaterial part of man. They predicate of his soul what belongs to his body, and they predicate of his body what belongs to his soul. (See Ez. 18:20. Matt. 16:17.)

Whatever degree of dignity and capacity was added to the Son of man, by the peculiar union of the Son of God, he was still human and limited in all his powers. The sufferings, which he endured on the cross, were human sufferings; and, by their very nature, were limited in degree. But if we add to this, the abasement of the divine Son, which is unspeakably more important, there will appear to be no deficiency in the extent or efficacy of the atonement.

If these are the constituent parts, or the matter of the atonement, there is no ground for the objection, that it was made wholly by the man Christ Jesus, and that it is limited in its nature and in its value. Let it be kept in view that the object of the atonement is to support divine authority, and express divine abhorrence of sin as fully as if the law had its natural course, and mankind suffered its penal consequences. When it is brought into the estimate that the Son of God was divine; that he was infinitely dear to the Father; that in obedience to his will he volutarily sustained the deepest degree of humiliation; and that the Son of man, who was in the nearest and most endearing connexion with himself, suffered death of the most ignominious and painful kind, it appears that the law was magnified and made honorable, while forgiveness of sin was offered to transgressors on merciful conditions. It appears that this substitution has expressed as great

regard for the law, and as great disapprobation of sin, as if the whole race of man had remained under its curse, without any provision for their deliverance.

Why might not the Deity pardon transgressors without a sacrifice, as well as pardon them on the ground of a sacrifice made principally by himself? It is not our province to assign reasons for all the dealings of the Most High; nor for the peculiar method, which he has adopted in the scheme of redemption. But it must be considered that, in the economy of grace, the Father holds authority; and the Son is subordinate, and subjected to his control; and that this is the ground of the covenant, which makes provision for the salvation of man. Of course, the Son might do that in behalf of the human race, which might be acceptable to the Father, while he made them offers of mercy. If there were simple unity in the divine Nature, it appears that this method, the method of sacrifice, would be impracticable.

Should God grant pardon, in a single instance, without an atonement, he might, on the same principle, forgive others to any extent; and mankind would take encouragement to violate the divine law with hope of impunity. But this consequence does not follow from the atonement, as it is brought to our view in the Gospel. Though there is a propitiation made sufficient for the sins of the whole world, yet no one will receive pardon except on the condition of repentance and reformation. The wicked can find no encouragement on this ground, to continue in sin; for while they retain their habits of iniquity, they are as fully under the penal threatenings of the law as if no sacrifice had been made; and they have no interest in pardoning mercy, nor can they have, while they persevere in transgression. There is as much necessity of holiness of heart and life, under the provisions of the Gospel, as if righteousness and justification were by the law. The design and work of Jesus were not only to save people from the penalty due to their sins, but to save

them from the practice and guilt of them. For this purpose he has authority, by the covenant of redemption, to send the Holy Spirit into the world to convince of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; to change the disposition of the human heart; to sanctify the affections and to keep the subjects of his effectual operations through faith unto salvation. This appears to be necessary, in order to prepare them to receive the remission of their sins. For if they were pardoned in a state of impenitence, and rebellion against divine authority, it would frustrate alike the design of the law and of the atonement.

Inseparably connected with the sacrifice of Christ, is his obedience. In his abasement and sufferings, he was submissive to the will of the Father. He yielded a perfect obedience to the divine law; and proved that it was holy, just and good. He gave as full and clear evidence in favor of the divine commands, as mankind would have done by a perfect observance of them. Had the Lord Jesus Christ made only an expiation for sin, he would only have saved them from suffering; he would not have procured for them the reward of righteousness. But he did not leave the work of salvation unfinished. He is "the Lord, our Righteousness. He is the end of the law for righteousness." He has suffered the penal part, and he has obeyed the preceptive part of the law for the human race. He has fulfilled the law; and he maintains its dignity and efficacy, while he offers pardon and reward to those, who believe on his name. On this plan the faith of men is accounted to them for righteousness; and God is just, while he justifies them. Had any created being, of whatever grade, proposed to substitute his obedience for the obedience of the human race, so that his righteousness might be accounted to them, could he have done it? Could he have performed more than his own duty, so that he could have had a surplus of righteousness, which might be set to their account; and for which they

might receive the reward of everlasting blessedness? Were reward granted on this ground, would not the law greatly suffer; and would not people set a small value upon a righteousness and its reward, which might be obtained at so low a rate?

If we examine the ancient sin offering, and view it in connexion with the sufferings and death of Christ, we shall obtain light on the subject. The type and the antitype unite their influence to lead us into the knowledge of a truth the most interesting to a fallen world. "The Hebrews had properly but three sorts of sacrifices; the burnt offering, which was wholly consumed, only the priest had the benefit of the skin, Lev. 7:8. The sacrifice for sin, or expiation for him, who had fallen into any offence against the law, Lev. 4. The peace offering, which was offered voluntarily, in praise to God, or to ask favors, &c. Lev. 7:31,34."

The trespass offering was an expiatory sacrifice. The law concerning this was explicit. "If a soul sin and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbor, in that which was delivered him to keep; —or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth falsely,—he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto; and he shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord, a ram without blemish out of the flock.— And the priest shall make an *atonement* for him before the Lord, and it shall be forgiven him for any thing of all he hath done in trespassing therein." (See Leviticus 6:) For a sin of a different kind the transgressor was required to "bring his trespass offering unto the Lord; and the priest shall make *atonement* for him with the ram of the trespass offering before the Lord for the sin, which he hath done; and the sin which he hath done shall be forgiven him," Lev. 19:21,22.

When Aaron and his sons were consecrated to the priest's office, Moses brought a bullock for a sin offering; and they laid their hands upon the head of the bullock, and he slew it for a sin offering. (See Lev. 8:)

After the death of Aaron's sons, it was an established ordinance for him and his successors to offer a sin offering once a year for himself and for the sins of the people. He sacrificed a bullock to make *atonement* for his own sins. For the people he took two goats; one he sacrificed; and over the other, with his hands on its head, he confessed their iniquities, putting them upon the head of the goat; and then he sent it, bearing their sins, into the wilderness. (See Leviticus 16:) This was the law for making atonement for the sins of the priest, and for the sins of the people.

Had we no further information on this subject than what we derive from the law of sacrifices, we could discover no wisdom in their institution; no efficacy in the blood of beasts; no connexion between the sacrifice of animals and the forgiveness of sin. But the apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, gives us the information on this subject, which we need. He speaks of the legal sacrifices; contrasts them with the sacrifice of Christ; and shews the vast superiority of the latter. "The law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered; because that the worshippers once purged, should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. But Christ being come an high Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of

Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?—Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others. For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world, but now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (See Heb. 9: and 10:)

From a contrast of the Jewish sin offerings with the sacrifice of the high priest under the gospel dispensation, we perceive that the former were but a shadow of good things to come; that they were a representation of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God; and that they derived all their meaning, and all their efficacy from this connexion. If the legal sin offerings were appointed to be efficacious in procuring remission of sin, much more would the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, in which all others terminated, lay a foundation for the pardon of sinners. Without this allusion, the Hebrew ritual appears as unmeaning and unavailing as the superstitious rites of the heathen.

If the Jews, as a nation, had waxed gross, and through their carnal ordinances did not discern spiritual things, there is no reasonable doubt that the Jewish saints viewed the trespass offering as an expiatory sacrifice, looking forward to the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, and drawing all its import and all its value from that source. The ancient prophecies shed some glimmering rays upon this one, great sacrifice. The saints by faith caught the light; and like Abraham, they saw the day of Christ, and were glad. If, at the time the Messiah was upon earth, the principal part of the Jewish nation had no idea of a *suffering Savior*, there is no doubt there were some of that nation, who had correct views of the prophecies relating to his incarnation and death; and had faith in the divine promises. Caiphas, the high priest, though an enemy of Jesus, appeared to have correct views of

the design of his sacrifice. "It is expedient for us," said he, "That one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.—He prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation. And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one, the children of God, that were scattered abroad."

The scriptures very fully and clearly represent the sufferings of Christ to be a sacrifice for sin. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.—The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.—For the transgression of my people was he stricken.—He bare the sin of many. (See Isaiah 53:) This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. (Matt. 26:28.) For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ranson for many. (Mark 10:45.) Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption, that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. (Rom. 3:24,25.) Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. (Rom. 4:25.) For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.—But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. (Rom. 5:6,8,9,10.) For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.—For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures. (1 Cor. 5:7; and 15:3.) For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. (2 Cor. 5:21.) In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of

sins. (Col. 1:14.) Who gave himself a ransom for all. (1 Tim. 2:6.) Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. (Heb. 9:28.) Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold;—but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. (1 Peter, 1:18,19.) He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.—And sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. (1 John 2:2; and 4:10.) They sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." (Rev. 5:9.) These texts and many more of similar import, clearly shew that Christ was offered as a sacrifice for sin; and that in consequence of his propitiatory offering, transgressors may receive forgiveness. If these passages do not convey this idea, it appears to be impossible to find language, which will convey it.

From this view of the subject, it appears that Jesus Christ has made an atonement for sin, and that this is the *ground*, on which forgiveness is offered to transgressors, on certain merciful conditions. There is a manifest distinction between the meritorious, or procuring cause of pardon, and the terms, on which it may be received. Because the law is magnified and made honorable by the sufferings and obedience of Christ, it does not follow that the law is made void; and that it has no further claims upon mankind. Because there is a propitiation made for the sins of the whole world, it does not follow that all have a claim to exemption from punishment; or that all will be forgiven. It must be remembered that faith and repentance, on the part of the transgressor, are exercises of mind and heart, which are indispensable in order to receive the mercy of pardon. The atonement, on the part of Christ, and faith and repentance, on the part of the transgressor, are set forth in the Scriptures to be absolutely necessary to salvation.

When one only is mentioned in connexion with forgiveness, the other is not excluded, but implied, or understood.

The atonement originated in divine mercy. God was angry with the wicked, as sinners. But as the workmanship of his hand, as intelligent creatures, capable of serving, honoring, and enjoying him for ever, he loved them. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us. We love him because he *first* loved us." The Father was not moved, by the sacrifice of his Son, to shew mercy. But in the exercise of his mercy, he adopted this as an expedient, by which he could consistently offer pardon to his rebellious subjects. The Father and Son were of one mind on this subject. The Father was willing to give up his Son to be a sacrifice for sin; and the Son was equally willing to become a sacrifice, so that salvation might be offered to sinners.

If we cannot discover any natural connexion between the suffering and obedience of one, and the forgiveness and reward of another, our want of discernment forms no argument against the reality, or wisdom of this plan. Many things occur in the natural and moral world, for which we cannot account; and whose connexion we cannot discover. In civil government, rulers often suffer in consequence of the vices of their subjects; and subjects often receive great blessings in consequence of the wise administration of their rulers. In families, the prudent conduct of parents proves to be a great blessing to their children; and the vicious practices of children bring great sufferings upon their parents. A similar connexion runs through the various grades of society. In many instances, great natural evils, which were intended as such by their authors, have resulted in the most beneficial effects. If this method is found in the constitution of nature, under the administration of the divine Sovereign, why should not the same principles be admitted when they are found in the scheme of redemption?

The greatness of the atonement, as it has been exhibited, is no evidence that it was not appointed and adopted by the divine Sovereign, as an expedient for the salvation of this sinful world. If it appear to any to be disproportionate to the effects, which are designed to be produced by it, it arises from ignorance of the worth of the soul, and of its bearing upon the moral government of God. The human soul, though of limited powers, possesses an extensive capacity. It is capable of continual progression in knowledge and enjoyment. There is no doubt that there will be a point in eternity, when it will be equal in its faculties to the most exalted angel, who now ministers before God's throne; and that it will be then in a state of progressive improvement.

If it were an object unworthy of the Son of God, to humble himself, to provide salvation for such an individual, then bring to view the first human pair with the whole line of their posterity, diverging into thousands of branches, extending to thousands of generations, and spreading over the breadth of the whole earth. View this extensive province, not merely once replenished with inhabitants, but peopled thousands of times, and removed in succession to another world, to receive their everlasting destination. View this multitude, which no man can number, and say, is not their salvation an object of immense magnitude? Is it not an object worthy of God to accomplish? If it were not inconsistent with the dignity of the divine Being, to form and support such a species of beings as mankind, it cannot be inconsistent with his dignity to make provision for their reformation, for their forgiveness, and for their future blessedness. Besides, the atonement of Christ in connexion with the economy of redemption, is made known to the angelic host; and probably it is disclosed to other systems of intelligences amidst the immensity of creation; and it may serve as a link in the chain of divine government to connect and support its various parts.

When we take into consideration the constituent parts of the atonement, its effect upon the moral condition of man, and upon divine government, it appears that no created being was adequate to this work.

It is presumable that the first offerings and sacrifices were instituted by divine authority. In a history so concise as that of Moses, there can be only a sketch of the most prominent events. But many truths may be discovered by induction. Cain and Abel brought their respective offerings unto the Lord. It is not improbable that sacrifices were made before this time. But these were recorded because they were accompanied with peculiar and important circumstances. What could have induced these brothers, if they were not required, to make these offerings to the Lord? If they presented them as gifts to the great Proprietor of all, to avert his displeasure, or render him propitious, analogy fails to give it support. They then held their property in common; and, of course, they did not know by experience what effect gifts would produce upon their fellow beings; and consequently they would find it difficult to infer what effects they would produce in relation to the Creator.

The circumstance, that Abel was accepted in his offering, is an evidence that this rite was of divine institution. It can hardly be supposed that fallen creatures were left to invent for themselves a method of worship, or of sacrifice; and it is equally improbable that they should invent a method, which would be pleasing to the Lord. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." He had faith in the divine promise: "the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." Through his sacrifice of beasts he looked forward to the sacrifice of the promised Seed. As Abel discerned this connexion between the sacrifice and the divine promise, there is no reasonable doubt that this sacrifice was instituted by divine authority. Further, the use of flesh was not given to man till after the flood. It is

not probable, therefore, that Abel would have dared to take away the life of animals, even for sacrifice, if he had not been commanded by God. The sacrifice of animals was a sin offering; and when Abel made this offering to the Lord, he was conscious of his guilt; he had confidence in the divine promise, and faith in that blood, which cleanseth from all sin. If the law respecting sacrifices was not given in a formal manner till a long period after the apostasy, it, by no means follows that they were not of divine institution during that interval. The decalogue was not communicated in a formal manner till the time of Moses. But there is no reasonable doubt that every one of the ten commands had been made known before; and were as binding as they were afterward.

It is not probable that reason *invented* the expedient of sacrifice for sin. Some have traced it to this origin, and others have contended that the doctrine is very unreasonable. There appears to be no moral connexion between the sin of one and the suffering of another; nor between the suffering of one and the forgiveness of another. If this be true, how have sacrifices generally obtained in every age through the world, where revelation has not been enjoyed? There is no reasonable doubt that sacrifices have been perpetuated by tradition. The nations, which descended from Noah, were acquainted with the sacrifices which God had instituted. When the revelations of the divine will were deposited among one nation, the Jews, other nations still retained a knowledge of sacrifices; and this knowledge was handed down from one generation to another. In addition to this, many heathen nations were acquainted with the Jews, and with their religion. From them they might keep in remembrance the institution of sacrifices, but with great corruptions. It appears much more reasonable that heathen sacrifices grew out of Jewish, or patriarchal, than that these were engraffed by the divine hand upon their's.

The prevalence of sacrifices among heathen nations generally, if not universally, affords evidence that they are conscious of guilt; and feel the necessity of an expiation for sin. If they believed that repentance and reformation would secure their forgiveness and restore them to the favor of their offended God, they would not seek pardon by sacrifice. But as they have ever sought it in this way, it follows that unassisted reason never taught them that they could obtain pardon without this expedient.

It appears by the laws which were communicated to Moses concerning sacrifices, that the trespass offering was of an expiatory nature. When people had transgressed the commandment of the Lord, they were commanded to bring an animal for a trespass offering; to lay their hand upon its head and slay it. The priest took of the blood with his finger and put it upon the horns of the altar; and poured out the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar. The priest made an atonement for their sin; and it was forgiven him. See Lev. 4: 5: 6:

The ceremony respecting the scape goat is a striking representation of the transference of sin. The transgressions of the people were confessed over the goat; put upon his head; and he bore them away into the wilderness. By this method atonement was made for the sins of the people. These sacrifices, viewed by themselves, appear inefficacious and unmeaning. "In those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins," Heb. 10:3,4. But when these sacrifices are viewed in connexion with their antitype, they appear significant and important. The apostle Paul contrasts the sacrifices under the law with the sacrifice of Christ; and shews most clearly that the latter, both in respect to victim and priest, infinitely exceeded the former. From the contrast it appears that the Jewish sacrifices were types of Christ's sacrifice; and that

from connexion with it, they derived all their importance. If those symbols, in connexion with the thing prefigured, were ordained to make a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, it is an unavoidable conclusion that the reality itself is adequate to this purpose.

"He is the *propitiation* for our sins," &c. 1 John 2: 2. "The word Ἱλασμος is no where found in the New Testament, but in this passage, and in chap. 4:10. But it occurs often in the LXX translation of the Old Testament, where it signifies *a sacrifice of atonement.* Thus Lev. 6:6,7. Numb. 5:8. Κριός ἱλασμα is *a ram for a sin offering.* And Ezek. 44:27, προσφερειν ἱλασμον is, *to offer a sin offering.* In considering the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, John, like the other apostles, followed his Master, who in the institution of his supper, directed his disciples to consider it, as designed to bring to their remembrance his blood, *shed for the many, for the remissions of sins.* (Macknight.)

"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation," Rom. 3:25. Whether ἱλαστηριον alludes to the cover of the ark, or whether it expresses the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, its import is the same, or nearly the same, because it was on the cover of the ark, or mercy seat, the atonements were accepted, and pardons were dispensed. Christ, as a propitiatory sacrifice, was represented by the mercy seat. He, "by his atonement, covered our sins, and bore the curse for us; standing between God and the curse of the law for our sakes, that God might look on the law through Christ, as fulfilled by him on our behalf."

ON THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

WHO being in the form of God,—*was made in the likeness of men*, Phil. 2:6,7. Not only the divinity, but the *humanity* of Christ has been denied. So mysterious is the union of human and divine nature, that at an early period of Christianity, even in the apostle's time, some attributed to the Savior only one nature. One sect believed him to be only human; another believed him to be only divine. The same unscriptural sentiments, with some modifications, have been continued till the present day. If there be none in the present age, who denies that the Son of God was united with any degrees of humanity, there are those, who deny that the body of Christ was animated by a human soul. As it is designed to exhibit a *general* view of the nature and character of the Savior, it is necessary to consider his humanity.

Christ is repeatedly called in the sacred Scriptures man, and the Son of man. When Peter denied his Lord, he called him a man, saying, "I know not the *man*." When the centurion witnessed the crucifixion of Jesus, he exclaimed, "Truly this *man* was the Son of God." When Pilate expressed his opinion respecting the allegations brought against Christ, he said, "I find no fault in this *man*." The Jews called Christ a *man*. They accused him of blasphemy, saying, "because thou being a *man*, makest thyself God." In these and other instances, Christ is called a *man* by persons, who were not under the influence of divine

inspiration. They spoke of him according to appearance. He appeared to them to be a *man*. But we are not confined to human *appearance* for evidence of Christ's humanity. The apostle Paul, who was under the inspiration of God's Spirit, called Jesus Christ a *man*. Preaching to the Athenians concerning the resurrection, he said, "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that *man*, whom he hath ordained." In his epistle to the Romans, he contrasts Christ with Adam. He speaks of the extensive and deleterious effects of Adam's sin; and in view of this, he declares the extensive and beneficial effects of the obedience of Christ. His language is, "As by *one man's* disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of *one* shall many be made righteous." The phraseology of this passage authorizes a belief that *one*, in the latter part of the text, means *one man*, which is Jesus Christ. "For, since by man came death, by *man*, (i. e. Christ,) came also the resurrection of the dead." "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second *man* is the Lord from heaven. There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the *man* Christ Jesus." Christ repeatedly called himself the Son of man. Interrogating his disciples concerning peoples' opinion of himself, he said, "Whom do people say that I the *Son of man* am?" This appellation is frequently given by the Evangelists to Christ.

The two angels who were sent to Sodom to destroy the place, and to save Lot and his family, had the *appearance* of men. On account of this appearance they were called men. But it is presumable that they did not actually assume flesh and blood. They probably assumed this appearance because they could, in this manner, more intelligibly communicate information, and avoid the appearance of miraculous interposition. Christ, before his incarnation, appeared at times in the likeness of a man. When he wrestled with Jacob, he appeared as a man, and he was called

a *man*. The scriptures give this account of the transaction. "Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a *man* with him until the breaking of the day. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face."

Because angels appeared, at times, in human likeness, and were called men; because Christ, in the early ages of the world, appeared in human likeness, and was called a man, though neither he nor they were encompassed by humanity, it does not follow, that Christ, when he abode upon earth, was not invested with human nature; that he only had the appearance of a man, without the reality. He was the *seed* of the woman. He descended from the house of David. If his conception was different from the ordinary course of nature, this circumstance does not affect his humanity. Adam was formed in a manner different from any of his posterity. But he was not the less human on account of the peculiar mode of his origination. Christ was born of Mary. He, undoubtedly, was nourished as other children. He increased in stature. He ate and drank. After long abstinence from food, "he was an hungred." It cannot be supposed that this was merely appearance; that there was no reality. It seems to be an impeachment of the human understanding to attempt to prove that Christ had a human body. But it is a greater impeachment to deny it.

Some, who admit that Christ had a human body, deny that he had a human soul. As this denial materially affects the character of Christ, it is necessary to investigate this point. When Christ is called in the sacred Scriptures, *man* and Son of man, there is no intimation given that these words are not to be understood according to their usual and natural import. By the word *man*, is understood a particularly organized body, animated by rational powers. A human body, which has been deprived of its spirit, cannot with propriety be called a man. Nor is it proper to apply

this term to a disembodied human spirit. It requires both of these substances, matter and spirit, to constitute a man. If the body of Christ was animated and actuated only by the Son of God, there would be no propriety in calling him a man; because it was destitute of an essential, and of the most important part of human nature. If the body of Christ was not animated by a human soul, it is not true that the Son of God was united with humanity. A piece of matter, organized like a human body, but destitute of a soul, is no more capable of human sensations, than a piece of matter differently organized. Consequently it could not be considered possessing the essentials of human nature.

The apostle Paul, speaking of Christ, asserts that he "was made in the *likeness* of men." The original word (ὁμοιωματι) translated *likeness*, signifies more than likeness of *appearance*. It signifies a real likeness, a likeness of nature. Christ was not made in the *real likeness* of men, if he resembled them only in the organization of his body. This would be comparatively a small resemblance. The apostle Paul, representing Christ undertaking the redemption of man, asserts, that "*in all things* it behoved him to be made *like* unto his brethren." If he had not a human soul, he was not made like his brethren in *all things*. In the most important points he was not made like them. The reason the apostle assigned why it behoved Christ to be made like his brethren was, "that he might be a *merciful* and faithful high Priest in things pertaining to God to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath *suffered*, being *tempted*, he is able to succor them that are tempted." The consequence of Christ's being made like his brethren was, he had human feelings. Christ in his divine nature *knew* what were the feelings, the passions, the infirmities and temptations of humanity. But in his divine nature he never *felt* them. In consequence of the divine Son's union with human nature he became

a *merciful*, as well as a faithful high Priest. He was tried by temptation. When he had fasted a long time, he felt the sensation of hunger. He had a desire for food like any man. In this situation he was tempted, when Satan proposed to him to supply himself with bread in a miraculous manner. He undoubtedly had a desire for the conveniences of life; but higher motives counteracted this desire. He was therefore subject to temptation, when all the kingdoms of the world were offered to him. In view of the sufferings, which awaited him, he desired, if it were possible, that they might pass from him. He was, therefore, tempted to shrink from the tortures of the cross. Christ speaking to his disciples concerning their faithfulness to him, said, "Ye are they, which have continued with me in my temptations." The apostle to the Hebrews says, "We have not an high Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." It is impossible that Christ should be subject to temptations as we are; that he should be *touched with the feeling of our infirmities*, if he had not a human soul. Separate the mind from the body, and it is hard to conceive how the body can have perceptions and sensations. Can the eye see and perceive; can the ear hear and understand, independently of the intellectual faculties? When intelligence is withdrawn, the body has no perception nor sensation. If there be a distinction between the sensitive and intellectual powers of man, there cannot be a proper man without such intellectual powers. If a humanly organized sensitive body may be supposed, it can have only animal sensations; it cannot have human feelings and passions, excepting on principles of modern philosophy, which makes the human soul a necessary result of a particular organization of matter.*

Such a being may have the appearance of a man; but it is not true that in *all things* he is made like unto

* See Priestley on Matter and Spirit.

a man. On the present supposition, the Son of God might as well (for aught we know to the contrary) have united with a body of any other shape, as with one of human shape. In this union, his feelings and sensations would have been only of divine and animal nature; but not of human nature. Consequently his incarnation would not have brought him into a nearer relationship with the human race. It would not have subjected him to human temptations; nor would it have capacitated him to sympathize with the infirmities of humanity, or to succor those, who were tempted. One great object of Christ's incarnation was, that he might have a *personal* knowledge of human nature; that he might be *personally* acquainted with the infirmities, the temptations and hardships, which are common to the human race. The infirmities of humanity are no less attached to the mind than to the body. If the body of Christ were not animated by a human soul, he could not be tempted as we are; he could not be *conscious* of our infirmities; he could not feel, as we do, the hardships of human life; his incarnation would not capacitate him to sympathize with us in our afflictions, nor to succor us when we are tempted.

The account, which the sacred scriptures give of Christ, is a decisive proof that he possessed a human soul. It is recorded that he *increased in wisdom.* If his body was animated only by a divine Spirit, it was not possible that he could *increase* in wisdom. Divinity is unchangeable. The Son of God is called Wisdom. This divine attribute is not capable of increase nor diminution. His *increase* of wisdom, therefore, must be of human wisdom.

One object of Christ's incarnation was, to manifest that the divine law was holy and just and good; that it required no more than human nature was capable of performing. If the body of Christ was actuated only by divine intelligence, his obedience of the divine law would give no evidence that human nature was

capable of the same obedience. It would be an example which might not be wholly calculated for our imitation. At least it would not carry evidence with itself that we are capable of obedience. To give evidence that the law was righteous, and to set an example for the human race, it was necessary that he should obey in a nature like our's; i. e. a nature composed of body and soul.

How far the Son of God sustained the Son of man; or whether he afforded him any extraordinary support, it is difficult to determine. It is evident that Christ, in his human nature, received extraordinary communications of the *Holy Spirit.* When he was baptized the Holy Ghost descended upon him. It is not to be supposed that the Holy Ghost communicated the divine Son to the man Christ Jesus. It is not the office of the Spirit to send the Son. The divine nature of Christ did not need the communications of the Holy Spirit. It was complete in itself; and was competent to the duties of its office. The effusions of the Holy Spirit were shed upon the human nature of Christ to capacitate him for the work of redemption. As he had more to perform, more to endure, than human nature ever performed or endured, more copious effusions of the Spirit were made to him. The Spirit was not communicated to him by measure. The Spirit led Jesus into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. Without doubt he granted him his sustaining influence. When Christ taught in the synagogue, he read a prophetic passage, which related to the Messiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me." The apostle Peter bore testimony "how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." The apostle Paul to the Hebrews, speaking of the Son, says, "God, even thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." This was the anointing of the Holy Spirit at his consecration; and he was anointed in a more extraordinary degree than any of his fellows, the prophets,

priests, or kings. The man Christ Jesus received not only the aids of the Holy Spirit, but he received the ministration of angels. After he was tempted by Satan, "angels came and ministered unto him." When he was in agony on the mount of Olives, and prayed to the Father, that, if he were willing, the cup might pass from him, "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven strengthening him."

The influence of the Holy Spirit and the ministration of angels are afforded to man. This completes the parallel between the man Christ Jesus and the human race. He personally knows the assistances they receive, and the temptations and hardships which they endure; and he is perfectly qualified to make a just distinction between human infirmities, and the evil propensities of human nature.

The sacred Scriptures attribute human passions to Jesus Christ. He appears to have had human views and human feelings, and to be actuated like a holy man. At a time he *rejoiced* in spirit. At other times he suffered the pains of grief. The prophet describing the low condition of Christ, says, "He is despised and rejected of men, a man of *sorrows* and acquainted with *grief.* Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." His life corresponded with this prophetic description. At the grave of Lazarus he wept. He shed tears over impenitent Jerusalem. In view of approaching death and of its attending circumstances, he was in agony. He said, "Now is my *soul troubled.* My *soul* is exceedingly sorrowful even unto death." He prayed that, if it were possible, he might be delivered from the hour of dissolution, which just awaited him. He appeared to have the same struggle between a sense of duty and the infirmity of human nature, which it would be expected any holy man would have. When he was on the cross and suffering its tortures; when the Father withdrew the light of his countenance, and it was the hour of the power of darkness, he exclaimed, My God, my God,

why hast thou forsaken me? This is not the language of divinity. This is the language of suffering humanity.

At times Jesus Christ manifested anger. When the Pharisees watched him whether he would heal on the Sabbath-day, "he looked round about on them with *anger*." When Jesus went up to Jerusalem and saw that the temple was made a place of traffic, he manifested a zeal for the honor of his Father's house. He expressed indignation when he used the scourge, poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables.

The Savior manifested a love, which had every appearance of human love. When the rich young man addressed him in terms of respect; appeared polished in his manners and regular in his life, Jesus beholding him *loved* him. He appears to have had a peculiar affection for the family of Mary. John was the disciple, whom Jesus *loved*.

When Christ is said to be angry, to be grieved; to rejoice; to exercise love; to suffer pain, there is no appearance that these affections are to be understood figuratively. When he manifested these affections to the senses, he manifested them really, not figuratively. If a human soul was not united with the body of Jesus, it is impossible that he should have had these affections. If his body was animated only by the divine Son, it is impossible that he should be tempted as we are, for God is not tempted with evil; and it is absurd to suppose that a mere body is subject to temptation.

There is a manifest propriety that the Mediator between God and man should possess divine and human nature. By this union he would feel an interest in the rights of both parties. While he vindicated the rights of God's throne, he would have compassion on the infirmities of humanity. Had he been only divine, the sinful race of man might, perhaps, have accused him of partiality to the cause of his Father, while he neglected to plead their cause. Had he been only human, he might have neglected divine

rights; and have exercised an undue partiality for his brethren. But by possessing both natures, he will exhibit evidence that he pays just regard to both parties; and of course, every mouth will finally be stopped before God.

The human mind cannot comprehend the union which subsists between the Son of man and the Son of God. Neither can it comprehend the union between soul and body. It does not understand how matter affects spirit, and how spirit affects matter. It does not understand how the divine Spirit sustains and moves the inanimate world; nor does it understand how he supports and gives operation to the human soul and body. These are acknowledged truths. They are not denied, because they cannot be comprehended. If the divine Mind pervades all things; and moves all things, it is not incredible that he should have a peculiar residence and efficiency in the man Jesus Christ.

It is written, "The Word was made *flesh*." The apostle Peter, speaking of the patriarch David said, "God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the *flesh*, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." The apostle Paul saith, "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the *flesh*." "When he cometh into the world he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not; but a *body* hast thou prepared me." Because the term flesh is applied to Christ; because a *body* was prepared for him; it does not follow that his flesh was not animated by a human soul. It is well known that in the sacred Scriptures, as well as in other writings, that a figure is used, which puts a part for the whole. The word flesh is often used in the Bible to signify not only the human body, but the whole person. "God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for *all flesh* had corrupted his way upon the earth." It cannot be supposed that human bodies are here spoken of to the

exclusion of human souls. It is not supposed that the bodies only corrupted his ways and the souls kept themselves pure. The Psalmist, desiring to see the power and glory of God, saith, "My *flesh* longeth for thee." It is not rational to suppose that the word flesh in this passage signifies his material, to the exclusion of his spiritual part. There are many other passages in the sacred Scriptures, too numerous to be quoted, in which the word flesh signifies the whole person; and in those passages it is the most *natural* signification of the word. Consequently, it *may* signify a complete human person when it is applied to Christ. The Word was made *flesh*, i. e. he was made in the *likeness* of men.

There is such a union between the Son of God and the Son of man, that some of the qualities of each are, in the Scriptures, applied to the other. "The second *man* is the Lord from heaven." In this passage, a divine name is given to the Son of man. Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine *Holy One* to see corruption. The divine title, Holy One, was applied to the body of Christ.

So nearly united were the humanity and divinity of Christ, that he sometimes spoke of one nature, sometimes of the other. If there be so intimate a union between Christ and believers, that they are called members of his body, it is not incredible that the Son of God should have a peculiarly intimate union with the Son of man.

A SUMMARY VIEW OF THE EVIDENCES OF THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

After examining generally the evidences of the sacred scriptures in favor of the existence of God, the divine unity and the divine plurality; and after examining particularly their evidences in favor of the divinity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, it is suitable to bring these evidences into one view that we may feel their united force. Every source of evidence affords a rich supply of arguments in proof of the subject. But when all the sources are opened, and their united strength is made to bear upon opposing systems, it is hoped they will carry conviction, where a single argument, or a single source of evidence would fail.

The existence of God, is written as with a sunbeam on all the works of nature. "The invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." The unity of God is argued from the correspondence between the different parts of the world; from the uniformity of divine government; from the coincidence of the different parts of the sacred scriptures; and from the sameness of Spirit, which runs through the whole system. The unity of Israel's God was expressly taught by divine authority in contradistinction to the multiplicity of the gods of the heathen. Plurality in

the divine nature is deducible from the divine name of plural number; from the specification of distinctions in the divine nature; and from different and significant names applied to the Deity.

Revelation has not left us with only these general ideas of God. While it exhibits the unity of the divine essence, it exhibits certain distinctions, which constitute a ground of intercourse and of reciprocal compact.

The Father occupies the first place in the work of redemption. He possesses no priority of existence, nor superiority of nature, compared with the Son and Spirit. But according to the methodical arrangement of infinite Wisdom, there is order of offices in the dispensation of grace. By reciprocal consent the Father holds the first office; the first in respect to order and number. The authority which the Father had to send the Son was by mutual consent. The universal authority which the Son had in heaven and in earth, after his resurrection, was also by mutual consent. The terms, Father and God, are often used in the scriptures as synonymous.

The doctrine of the Trinity is not incidentally expressed or alluded to in the scriptures. It is not confined to some solitary passage or page, as if it were interpolated, or casually dropped from the penman of the sacred oracles. It is a prominent doctrine. Divine plurality appears in the first sentence of divine inspiration. It was gradually unfolded in ancient times. After the advent of Christ it was revealed with greater clearness and distinctness. In short, it is a doctrine interwoven through the whole system of revelation.

The divinity of Christ is inferred from a multiplicity of evidences, each of which appears to be conclusive. Divine names are given to him. The most exalted names of God, names, significant of his existence are applied to him. Some divine names, it is true, are given to creatures. But all divine names are not given to any creature. But the highest divine names are given

to Christ. When they are applied to creatures, they are applied with such restrictions and qualifications, and with such evident relation to *creatures*, that they are not calculated to lead people into the belief that they are divine. When they are applied to Christ, they are applied without limitation. No intimation is given that these names are not literally applied. If Christ had not been divine, there is no doubt that some qualification or restriction would have been added to his titles to prevent people, naturally prone to idolatry, from giving him divine worship. As no such restriction is annexed to the divine titles of Christ, the scriptures are sadly calculated to mislead, if he be not divine. It seems that the frequent application of divine names, even the highest divine names to Jesus Christ, would prevent all objection to his divinity. If there were but one source of evidence to prove his Deity, if but one characteristic feature of divinity were attributed to him, there might be, perhaps, some ground to doubt his divinity. Such explanation might be given by deniers of his divinity, which would seem to take from him his divine claims.

But the divinity of Christ does not rest on one source of evidence. He has more than one divine feature. What is a name, a high name, unless it be appropriately given? What is a divine name, unless it designate divine nature? The same scriptures, which give divine titles to Christ, also ascribe to him divine attributes. Duration, knowledge, wisdom, presence, and power, are attributed to Christ in no less degree than to the Father. Sometimes a single divine attribute is hyperbolically given to a creature, not to designate divine nature, but to express some extraordinary quality. But this bears no proportion to the literal application of the whole assemblage of divine qualities to Jesus Christ. If divine attributes had been given to Christ only in a figurative sense, it would have been necessary that some notice should be given of the figurative allusion. But as no such notice was

given; as no limitations of number or degree were made to those divine attributes, which were ascribed to Christ, it is a natural inference that his nature is divine. If any should not admit that divine titles applied to Christ proved him to be divine, it seems that the additional evidence of divine attributes applied to him, would decide the question.

In addition to these evidences, the same works are attributed to Christ, which are attributed to God. He is the Author of creation. He was in concert with the Father and Spirit, when it was said, "Let *us* make man." He performed miracles by his own power and authority. He will raise the dead and judge the world. Greater works are not attributed to the Father than those, which are attributed to the Son. If the divinity of the Father is argued from his works, it is equally conclusive, to infer Christ's divinity from *his* works. If Christ was merely an instrument in the hand of the Father in the work of creation, and in the performance of miracles; and wrought only by the communication of his power, it would not be proper to attribute these works to Christ, excepting under certain restrictions. But as no such restrictions are applied to him, it is a fair conclusion that he wrought by his own power. It is impossible that almighty power should be transferred from God the Father to a creature; and it is also impossible that the operation of almighty power should be the act of a creature. If Christ be properly the Author of the works of creation and of miracles, he of course possesses divine power. If he be not properly the Author of the world and of miracles, the Scriptures are calculated to mislead, and they have misled the human mind.

The sacred Scriptures represent the knowledge and wisdom of the Son in as high degree as they represent the knowledge and wisdom of the Father. By way of eminence, the Son is called wisdom. By his works and dispensations he has proved that this name is

significant and appropriate. When he was upon earth, he had an intuitive view of transactions where his bodily eye could not penetrate. He knew what was in man. When his enemies meditated evil against him, he knew their thoughts. "No one knoweth the Father but the Son." This declaration implies that the Son had a knowledge of the Father. It requires an unlimited capacity to have knowledge of an infinite subject.

There is evidence from Scripture that the presence of the Son is as extensive as the works of creation. He represented himself to be at the same time in heaven and on earth. To his disciples, who were going into different parts of the world he said, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." His office as Intercessor implies that he is present with all his suppliants and hears their petitions.

The divine goodness of the Son is inferred from his works before his incarnation; from his dispensations on earth; from his official acts, which he will perform at the last day; and from his system of religion, whose tendency is of the most salutary nature. If the works, the dispensations and the religion of God prove his divine goodness, the same, being the works of the Son, prove with equal decision his divine goodness. If it was an act of goodness in the Father to send his Son into the world to redeem mankind, it was no less goodness in the Son to come into the world for this purpose.

The sacred Scriptures attribute no less authority to Christ than to the Father. He has authority over his ambassadors. He has authority over his church. He has authority to forgive sins. He has authority to judge the world and dispense retribution. He has all authority in heaven and in earth; all authority, which is essential to the office of Redeemer.

The Son is entitled to no less honor than the Father. This is inferred from the worship he has received. Immediately after he came into the world, wise men

went and worshipped him. The divine command was, "Let all the angels of God worship him." His disciples and others worshipped him; and he forbade them not. His own language was "that all men should honor the Son *even as* they honor the Father." If he had not been entitled to divine worship, he would not have required it; nor would he have countenanced it when it was offered him.

These evidences unite their force to prove the divinity of Christ. There are as great evidences in favor of the divinity of the Son, as there are in favor of the divinity of the Father. If these evidences do not prove the divinity of the former, neither do they prove the divinity of the latter. If we ask for more evidence, than the Scriptures afford, to prove the divinity of Christ, we must, to be consistent, ask for more evidence of the existence of God; and of the infinitude of his attributes. If the testimony of Scripture on this subject can be explained away, or be made to signify any thing or nothing, the testimony of Scripture on other subjects can be explained away, or be perverted with equal ease. If the cloud of evidences, which the Bible offers to prove the divinity of the Son, does not prove it, it is impossible to name evidence or evidences, which will prove it.

Each evidence, which has been adduced in favor of Christ's divinity, appears to be conclusive. But they appear with increased strength, when they are viewed together. Like the pillars of an edifice standing individually on their own bases, they stand more firm by their connexion.

The sacred Scriptures were designed to enlighten, not to confound the human understanding. They were designed to exhibit the divine nature and character; and the nature and condition of man. If the Scriptures take the characteristic traits of divinity and apply them, in all their extent, to humanity, they confound the Creator with the creature. They darken the human mind. They lead mankind directly into

idolatry. When the magicians copied with great precision the miracles, which God wrought by the hand of Moses, God saw fit to give a visible superiority to his own works, lest people should give that honor to the magicians, which was due only to himself. If Christ be a mere creature, and God applied so many divine properties to him, and did not manifest a decided superiority of himself, it might well be expected that people would esteem and honor him even as they esteemed and honored the Father. As the Scriptures attribute as great excellence of nature and as great dignity of character to the Son as to the Father, it is a just inference, that he is divine and is entitled to equal love and veneration. Those passages of Scripture, which represent Christ to be inferior to the Father, cannot be reconciled with those, which represent him to be equal with God, without admitting that he has two natures of unequal excellence; and that the former class of texts are applied to his inferior, and the latter class to his superior nature. If it be admitted that Christ has two natures, it is natural to expect that the Scriptures would sometimes speak of one nature; sometimes of the other; and that sometimes they would speak of him in both natures. As there are two classes of texts applied to Christ, one of which imports an inferior and the other a superior nature, there is the highest evidence that he possesses two natures. As these two classes designate human and divine nature, it follows that Jesus Christ is both human and divine.

If we contrast Jesus Christ with the most illustrious personages, that ever appeared on earth, personages, who by divine communications performed miracles and exhibited the most distinguished traits of character, we shall find an infinite superiority on the side of Christ; and we shall find an argument in favor of his divinity. "One reflection, which I beg you to make in finishing this part of my discourse, is that, if only one extraordinary and divine trait were to be found

here in the course of a long life, we might be inclined to believe that it sometimes pleaseth the Lord, to allow his glory and his power to shine forth in his servants. Thus, Enoch was carried up, Moses appeared transfigured on the holy mountain, Elijah was raised up to heaven in a fiery chariot, John the Baptist was foretold. But, besides that these were individual circumstances, and that the language of those miraculous men and of their disciples, with respect to the divinity and to themselves, left no room for superstition and mistake: here, it is an assemblage of wonders, which all, or even taken separately, would have been sufficient to deceive the credulity of men: here, all the different traits, dispersed among all these extraordinary men, who had been considered almost as gods upon the earth, are collected together in Jesus Christ, but in a manner a thousand times more glorious and more divine. He prophesies, but more loftily, and with more striking characters, than John the Baptist: he appears transfigured in the holy mount, but surrounded with more glory than Moses: he ascends to heaven, but with more marks of power and majesty than Elijah: he penetrates into the future, but with more accuracy and clearness than all the prophets: he is produced, not only from a barren womb like Samuel, but likewise by a pure and innocent virgin: what shall I say? And not only he does not undeceive men by certain and precise expressions upon his origin as purely human; but his sole language with respect to his equality to the Most High; but the sole doctrine of his disciples, who tell us that he was in the bosom of God from all eternity, and that all hath been made through him, who call him their Lord and their God, who inform us that he is all in all things, would justify the error of those who worship him, had even his life been, in other respects, an ordinary one, and similar to that of other men."*

* Massillon.

The only way, by which we know one class of beings from another, is by their respective peculiarities. Angels are distinguished from men by their disembodied state; by their superiority of capacity; and by their difference of employment. The divine Spirit is distinguished from angels and men by the peculiarities of his nature and the peculiarities of his works. If they, like him, be spirits, he possesses qualities infinitely superior to theirs; and he performs works infinitely beyond the limits of their capacities. If we find a character described in the sacred Scriptures, which does not rank with angels or men, but possesses all the peculiarities of divinity, it is agreeable to the rules of classification to call him divine. The Scriptures attribute all divine properties to Jesus Christ; and they must be perverted or rejected, if the conclusion that he is divine be denied.

Besides the Father and the Son, the sacred Scriptures exhibit another character, to which they attribute divine peculiarities. To the Holy Spirit they ascribe divine attributes; divine works; divine honors; they give him a distinct character, and they represent him acting in a distinct office; and bearing a certain relationship to the Father and Son. If the Holy Spirit be no more than the operation of the Father, it is hard to conceive why the Scriptures should give it significant and appropriate names; give it divine qualities, works and honors; and declare it to be more criminal to sin against it, than to sin against the Father or the Son. If the Holy Spirit be not divine; if he be not, in a certain sense, distinct from, as well as united to the Father and the Son, the Scriptures cannot be understood according to the most natural import of words.

Should we, in reading the history of any particular country, find three distinct characters, who had been employed in laying the foundation of a nation; and at a critical juncture, had, by their united exertions saved it from ruin; should we find human qualities attrib-

uted to them; and discover them to be authors of achievements, peculiar to men, we should naturally conclude, without labored arguments, that these were the authors of the same work; that they were three; and that these three were human. In the history of creation, and in the history of redemption, three distinct characters are brought to view. Each is represented with divine peculiarities; and exercising divine prerogatives. By analogy of reasoning it is a fair conclusion that these are three; and that they are of divine nature. If analogy ceases here, and does not prove that these three are one, we feel no need of analogy. The Scriptures are decisive on this point. They expressly declare that there is but one only living and true God. The first command of Jehovah is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." If the sacred Scriptures present to our view three distinct characters with divine peculiarities, and at the same time expressly assert that there is but one God, what shall be done with this seeming contrariety? Shall we reject the doctrine of the Trinity because we cannot clearly reconcile it with the divine unity? Why may we not as well reject the doctrine of the divine unity because we cannot reconcile it with the doctrine of the Trinity? Why may we not, on the same principle, reject both doctrines because we cannot reconcile them?

Our inability to comprehend a subject is not a conclusive evidence against its truth. Our inability to reconcile two propositions does not prove that they are not reconcilable; nor does it prove that both, or either of them, are untrue. If we had a perfect knowledge of the divine nature, we might say what could be, or what could not be predicated of it. But we are not competent to make a decision of this kind. Propositions, which in terms are contradictory, carry on the face of them their own falsity. Propositions, which are not contradictory and are not self-evident must be proved to be true or false by extraneous evi-

dence. The doctrine of the Trinity is not self-evident. It never has been intuitively perceived; nor has it been discovered merely by the power of reason. It is a doctrine of revelation. If it be substantiated from this source it stands. If it be not substantiated from this source, it falls. Revelation represents the Father to be divine; the Son to be divine; the Holy Spirit to be divine; and it represents only one God. These representations are not, in terms, a contradiction. We may, upon divine authority, safely believe both the plurality and the unity of God.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

The union of divine and human nature is a doctrine, which appears to be taught in the Scriptures. It is a doctrine, which, it is presumed, was never invented by reason; and, it is presumed, will never fall entirely within the compass of a finite understanding. But the unsearchable nature of the doctrine affords not a shadow of proof against its truth. If such a union be contradictory, or absurd, it is presumed that it is not revealed in the Scriptures. It cannot be, that the Author of human reason requires a belief of that, which *contradicts* the conclusions of that power of the mind. It is the province of reason to decide what is revealed; but it is not the province of reason to fathom all revealed truth. Reason teaches, that a system of religion, which embraces the infinite Spirit and an eternal state of existence, is not within the bounds of finite comprehension.

It appears to be not unreasonable, nor unphilosophical to suppose that divinity was united with humanity. In every human action, there is a co-operation of divine power. Without the supporting influence of the Deity, creatures can neither think nor move. This concurrence of divine and human operation is as far beyond our comprehension as the union of the Son of God with the Son of man. Man is composed

of matter and spirit. Rational, sensitive, and corporeal powers unite in one person. It appears to be no more contradictory, that divine power should be united with these, than that they should be united with each other.

There was a more special connexion between divine operation and those holy men of old, who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. There is another and different operation of divine power upon men, in causing them to be born again. The Holy Spirit *dwells* in those, who have been subjects of this divine influence. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God *dwelleth* in you?" 1 Cor. 3:16. In these cases, there is a certain connexion of divinity with humanity; and in each case divine operation is different. If it be not unphilosophical to admit this connexion of divinity and human nature, it appears to be not unphilosophical to admit that connexion, which the Scriptures represent to subsist between the Son of man and the Son of God. It is no more difficult to conceive this connexion than it is to conceive the immeasurable gift of the Spirit, or divine fulness dwelling in the man, Christ Jesus. If the former hypothesis be unphilosophical, so is the latter.

It is objected by some that it is not agreeable to sound philosophy to suppose that divine and human nature should so unite that they constitute but one person. We shall not contend for the phrase, one person, nor for the propriety of it, when applied to Jesus Christ. Viewed in his human and divine nature, he is different from all other beings; and it is obvious that many of those terms and phrases, which are appropriate to them, cannot be applied with the same propriety to him. One class of texts proves his humanity; another as evidently proves his divinity; and from both classes is inferred the union of both natures.

1. To this it is objected that "it divides the one Supreme Being, or essence.

2. It ascribes to one part of the indivisible and immutable essence, a property, or properties, which the others do not possess.

3. It ascribes two natures to the person of Christ, each of which separately considered, possesses all the properties necessary to constitute personality.

4. It ascribes all acts and sufferings to the human nature, that can be ascribed to the Mediator, or else supposes the immutable Essence capable of change, suffering, and death." (See *Purve's* Humble Attempt, &c. p. 87.)

These consequences, it is apprehended, do not follow from the admission of the doctrine under consideration. Spirit is not, like matter, divisible. When we speak of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we do not mean three distinct and separate beings. If any infer from the doctrine, this distinction in the divine nature, the inference is their own, not ours. We do not attempt to explain the *mode*, in which the Father, Son and Holy Spirit subsist. But we maintain, that we find it in the Scriptures, as we apprehend, that the Father is divine; that the Son is divine; that the Holy Spirit is divine; and that there is but one God.

It is admitted that the subject is mysterious; but it no more implies a division of divine nature, than the omnipresence of God. Those, who believe his existence, believe this is an attribute of his nature. They believe that he is in this world, and exercises his power, wisdom, and goodness. They believe that he is at the same time in heaven, exercising his power, wisdom, and goodness. But they do not believe there are two Gods; nor do they believe that divine nature is divided; nor do we infer this from their belief. We believe that the Father was in heaven exercising divine attributes, while the Son was upon earth exercising divine attributes. If a division of divine nature can be justly inferred from our belief, with equal

justice can it be inferred from theirs. Let us, for a moment, apply their argument to the omnipresence of God. The divine Being is present in this world either wholly, or in part. If he be wholly in this world, then he is not in heaven. If he be partly in this world and partly in heaven, then the divine Spirit is divisible and is composed of parts. Again, these parts are either finite, or infinite. If they be finite, it follows that two finite parts make one infinite whole. If they be infinite, it follows that there are two infinities in the divine nature. These inferences as naturally follow from their belief, as from ours. As they have drawn these conclusions themselves, it belongs to them, not to us, to dispose of them.

The second inference of the objector is founded on the first, as far as it relates to the divisibility of the divine nature; and we would apply the same observations. But we do not apply properties to the Father, which are not applied to the Son, nor do we apply properties to the Son, which are not applied to the Father and the Holy Spirit. By properties we understand qualities of a nature. The same qualities are attributed by the inspired writers to the Son, which are attributed to the Father. Still there is something peculiar to each. What this something is, which is the ground of their distinction is not revealed. But it appears that as the Son doeth nothing without the Father, so the Father doeth nothing without the Son; and that they, with the Holy Spirit, are united in their operation in every work.

We shall not attempt to explain the union of the Son of God with the Son of man. We cannot explain the union of body and soul. It is not surprising then that we cannot explain the union of divine and human nature. This union appears to be taught in the Scriptures; and it appears no more like absurdity and contradiction than the union of *divine fulness* with the man Christ Jesus. Are we charged with dividing the divine Essence, because we maintain that the Son of God was united with the Son of man? The charge

lies with equal weight against those, who maintain that divine fulness, or the immeasurable gift of the Spirit dwelt in Christ. The fulness of the Godhead, or divinity embraces all the divine perfections. If all divine perfections dwelt in Christ when he was upon earth, we retort the question upon the objector, where is the fulness of perfection of the Father? If the Father, in the plenitude of his perfections, dwelt in the man Christ Jesus on earth, how could he be, at the same time, in heaven without a division of his essence? If all the fulness of the Godhead was united with the human nature of Jesus, it follows, according to the argument of the objector, that the person of divinity is united to the person of humanity; and of course, "the Lord Jesus Christ consists of two persons, or else two persons are one person, or united in one."

To obviate this conclusion, recourse has been had to the apostle's prayer for the Ephesians, in which he requests that they "might be filled with all the fulness of God;" Eph. 3:19. From this it is inferred that the fulness of the Godhead, which dwelt in Christ, does not differ in its nature from that divine fulness, which is communicated to saints; that it means no more than that divine blessings or influences were abundantly bestowed upon him. But these passages do not appear to be parallel. John testifies that "of his (i. e. Christ's) *fulness*, have all we received." From this it appears that it was the same thing to receive the fulness of Christ, and the fulness of God. But what saint, prophet, or apostle had a divine fulness, which they could *impart* to others? The primitive Christians *occasionally* received those extraordinary influences of the Spirit, which were called the fulness of Christ or God. But it is not said, and it does not appear that this fulness was permanent in them. There is evidence to the contrary. The fulness of God, of which they were partakers, was, therefore, occasional and temporary. But in Christ all the fulness of the God-

head (divinity) dwelleth, κατοικεῖ. The preposition connected with this verb adds force to its meaning. It therefore signifies, not to occupy occasionally, but to dwell permanently. This divine fulness not only dwelt permanently in Christ, but it dwelt in him bodily; i. e. truly and substantially. We find that holy men have resembled, in a degree, almost all the features of Christ's character. But in every trait of his character there is a visible superiority, which distinguishes divinity from humanity. Another consequence, which has been drawn from the doctrine of the union of human and divine nature in Jesus Christ is, "It ascribes all acts and sufferings to the human nature, that can be ascribed to the Mediator, or else supposes the immutable Essence capable of change, suffering and death." This consequence does not appear to follow from the doctrine. It is not admitted that the sufferings of the humanity of Christ wholly constituted the atonement. It is maintained that the divine Son, if he did not suffer pain, suffered ignominy. He suffered a state of humiliation. He suffered the condition of a servant, the reproach of the cross. It is maintained that this suffering gave value, gave efficacy to the sacrifice, which was offered upon the cross. The Son of God could suffer this without sustaining any change in his nature. The perfections of divinity were not diminished by union with humanity. The Son of God was no less entitled to divine honors, when he was reviled upon the cross, than when he was seated on the right hand of the Father. We do not hold that merely the human nature of Christ mediates between God and man. We maintain that in both natures he acts in the office of Mediator. This does not involve the inconsistency of mediating between himself and the human race; because he mediates between the Father and them, and the Father is not the Son.

To the doctrine of Christ's divinity and humanity it is objected, "He would not say, himself could not

do, or did not know the things which all this while himself could do and did know very well; as to be sure, if he was the supreme God, he could and did. For this were to make him say what is most false, and to *equivocate* in the most deceitful manner." (See *Emlyn.*) This position is not correct. Christ could, with truth and agreeably to the common usage of language, deny that of one nature, which belongs to the other. He could, as Son of man, truly say, he knew not the day of the dissolution of the world, while, as Son of God, he knew the time. The Scriptures represent man as mortal. Job calls him "*mortal man.*" The same volume of inspiration represents man to be *immortal.* Christ hath brought life and *immortality* to light by the Gospel. Must the Scriptures be charged with deceit, equivocation and falsehood, because, at one time, they call man mortal; and at other times represent him to be immortal; because, at those particular times, they do not express any limitation? This accusation lies with as much force against the word of God in its representation of man, as against Jesus Christ in speaking of himself, sometimes in one nature, sometimes in the other. It is a usual manner of speaking among people to say, *I am mortal;* and at other times to say, *I am immortal;* and at the time to express no limitation. They are understood. They are not charged with falsehood, because it is known and admitted that they are composed of a material and mortal nature; and also of an immaterial and immortal nature. If we admit that human and divine nature were united in Jesus Christ, we perceive that he might, without equivocation, sometimes speak of himself as human, and at other times as divine; that the apostle might, at one time, call him "*the man Christ Jesus;*" and, at another time, call him "*the Lord from heaven.*" If Christ and his apostles had always spoken of him as a man, the conclusion would be fair, that he was only a man. If they had always spoken of him as God, it would be a fair con-

clusion that he was only divine. But as they sometimes speak of him possessing human qualities, and at other times possessing divine perfections, the conclusion is equally fair that he is both human and divine.

The Jews understood Christ to make himself equal with God and to make himself God; and they charged him with blasphemy. If he had been merely a man, it is presumed he would have repelled the charge in direct terms. But instead of this, he took them on their own ground, and refuted them on their own principles. He neither denied nor acknowledged his divinity; but shewed his accusers that upon their own principles he was justly exempt from the charge of blasphemy. This was all he needed to do, and this he did do. There were times, in which Christ expressed his meaning in ambiguous language. When people were speaking of the temple, he said, "destroy this temple, and in three days I will rear it up." They understood him to speak of the temple of the Jews. He often spoke in parables, which the multitude did not understand. Jesus said, "verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, *he shall never see death.*" The Jews understood him to speak of natural death; and he did not correct their mistake. But who dares accuse him with *deception, prevarication, and falsehood*?

ON THE DISTINCTION AND DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

THE same sacred Scriptures, which disclose the unity of God, disclose also certain distinctions, or a plurality in the divine nature. Immediately after it is related that God created the heaven and the earth, it is related that "the *Spirit* of God moved upon the face of the waters." This difference of phraseology used to express divine operations, affords evidence that there is in the divine nature ground for certain distinctions. If the Spirit of God were in no respect different from God, it is hard to conceive why the inspired historian should make so sudden change of the divine name; that he should first use a noun of plural number and then a noun singular, which was embraced in that plurality. When such distinctions are made in the inspired writings they are worthy of notice and investigation. The Spirit, under various names, is a prominent character in the Bible. From his works, his names, his attributes, and his connexion with the Father and the Son, may be inferred his nature and character.

The works of the Spirit are an evidence of his particular agency, and of his divinity. When the heaven and earth were created, "the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." At this time, when matter was in a chaotic state, and there was no vitality in the shapeless mass, "The Spirit of God moved upon" (or hovered over

מרחפת) "the face of the waters." At this early stage of creation, the water was not collected into separate bodies, but covered the whole earth. In the original, the word, which is translated Spirit, also signifies wind. Some have, therefore, supposed that only the wind of God passed over the face of the waters. But there are objections to this construction. There is no evidence that the subtil fluid, the atmosphere, was then created. If it were created as soon as the grosser matter of the earth, it can hardly be supposed that it was put in motion so as to become wind before the light and heat of the sun existed. It is more natural to suppose that the Spirit of God organized the matter, which was created, and infused into it prolific qualities. If it is the peculiar province of the Spirit to give spiritual life and restore order, it is easy to suppose that part of his work was to give natural life and establish order. If God, without manifested distinctions of Father, Son, and Spirit, created all things, it is not absurd to attribute to each, when these distinctions were disclosed, the whole work, or any of its parts.

"By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent;" i. e. a constellation of this name. It cannot reasonably be supposed that this text imports that by wind he hath decorated the sky with stars and planets; neither can it be supposed that in connexion with this it would be added that his hand had formed a constellation of a certain name. But let it be admitted, as it is in our translation of the Bible, that the Spirit of God adorned the heavens with stars, and that God's hand formed the constellation, the crooked serpent, then it follows that the same work, which is attributed to God, is also attributed to his Spirit.

Elihu reasoning with Job said, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." In this passage he connects the operation of the Spirit with the operation of the Almighty;

to one he attributes his life, to the other he attributes his formation. After man was formed of the dust of the ground, "the Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." In this text the word God, in the original is of plural number. Of course, it embraces all that is included in the divine plurality; and if the Spirit of God is any thing, which belongs to God, it embraces him; and consequently the life of the first man may be attributed to him. The Psalmist in his meditation on the majesty of God, the dependence of creatures, and their dissolution, observes, "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created" (or renewed.) In these passages, creative power is attributed to the Spirit.

The sending of teachers to instruct mankind is applied to God; to Christ; and it is also applied to the Holy Ghost. God, by his prophet Jeremiah, said, "I have even *sent* unto you all my servants the prophets." "These twelve Jesus *sent* forth and commanded them, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick; cleanse the lepers; raise the dead; cast out devils; freely ye have received; freely give." The Holy Ghost does the same work. The prophet Isaiah says, "The Lord God and his *Spirit* hath sent me." "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto *I* have called them. So they being *sent forth* by the Holy Ghost, departed into Sileucia. Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers."

God, Christ and the Holy Spirit communicate knowledge to teachers and people. "They shall be all taught of God. God shall reveal even this unto you." The apostle Paul speaking of the Gospel says, "Neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." The Lord Jesus taught him what to do when he arrested him on his way to Damascus. The Holy Spirit also reveals or teaches. "It was revealed unto him, (Simeon) by the Holy Ghost that

he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ." "The Comforter—he shall teach you all things; and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." God spake by those, whom he sent. "God—spake in time past unto the Fathers by the prophets. The Holy Spirit spake by the apostles. Christ cautioned his disciples not to premeditate what they should say when they should be brought before councils; and he adds, whatsoever shall be given you in that hour that speak ye; for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."

God, Christ and the Holy Spirit dwell in believers. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God.—If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are. Ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them. Know ye not your ownselves how that *Jesus Christ* is in you except ye be reprobates? That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." The same is said of the Holy Spirit. "Even the Spirit of truth—dwelleth with you and shall be in you. He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you? Know ye not that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

Sanctification is attributed to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit. Jude addressed his epistle "to them that are sanctified by God the Father." Of Christ it is said, "both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." The Holy Spirit is the Author of sanctification. "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit."

The second birth is attributed indiscriminately to God and to the Holy Spirit. "Which were born, not of blood,—but of God. Whosoever is born of God

doth not commit sin. Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world." The same work is attributed to the Spirit. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

God leadeth his people. "I am the Lord thy God, which *leadeth* thee by the way thou shouldest go." Christ leadeth them. "He calleth his own sheep by name and *leadeth* them." The Holy Spirit does the office of leader. "As many as are *led* by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. If ye be *led* by the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Not only God and Christ are called life; but the Holy Spirit is called by this name. "The Spirit is *life*." He is the Author of spiritual life.

The dead are raised by the Father, by the Son and by the Spirit. "The Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them." "We should not trust in ourselves, but in God, which raiseth the dead." Christ is the resurrection and the life. "The Son quickeneth whom he will." "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." The resurrection of Christ's body is attributed to the Holy Spirit. "Christ—being put to death in the flesh but *quickened by the Spirit*."

The Holy Spirit strives with sinners. When the antediluvian world had become exceedingly corrupt, God declared that his Spirit should not always *strive* with man. The commands, "Quench not the Spirit; grieve not the Spirit of God," imply that people are the subjects of the operation of the Spirit. The declaration of Stephen in answer to his accusation, "Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did, so do ye," supposes that the Holy Spirit exercises influence upon the human mind. He convinces of sin. He changes the heart. He sanctifies human nature.

Where he has begun a good work he will carry it on until the day of Jesus Christ. The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us.

The texts, which have just been quoted attribute certain works to the Spirit. It is evident that the name Spirit or Holy Spirit does not signify Father nor Son; for it is used both in connexion with them and it is used separately. Why should he be represented as the Author of different works, if there were not some ground of distinction in the divine Nature, by which he could act, in a certain sense, distinctly from the Father and the Son? Some divine works are performed by the divine Being in plurality. Other works are performed in a particular manner by the Father, or by the Son, or by the Holy Spirit. In the economy of redemption each has his peculiar office and work. They act so far distinctly that each performs works, peculiar to his office. They act so far unitedly that some of the same works are attributed to each. From the divine works there appears to be as much distinction between the Spirit and the Son, or the Spirit and the Father, as there is between the Son and the Father; and the Spirit appears to have a particular office and work no less than either.

The texts, which have been quoted, not only represent the Holy Spirit acting in a distinct office, but they represent him acting in union with the Father and the Son. The same works, which are attributed to them are also attributed to him. The act of creation, of sending teachers, of instructing them, of speaking by them, of dwelling in believers and leading them; of changing the heart and sanctifying it, and of raising the dead are attributed to him, and to the Father and the Son. If he were not divine he would not be united with them in these divine works. If he were not, in some respect, distinct, they would not be attributed to him. Although there is a distinction in the

divine nature; yet there is such a unity that many things, which are predicated of one are predicated of the others.

It belongs peculiarly to the office of the Spirit in the work of salvation to strive with sinners; to convince them of sin; to change their hearts; to carry on the work of sanctification; to give light and comfort to believers. He strove with the old world to reclaim them. He strove with sinners in the apostles' days, and he has striven with them in every age. It is he, who changeth the disposition of the heart; guides the mind into all truth, and administers consolation. In the apostolic age, he was the Author of miraculous gifts. At a time when the apostles were together, "There came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the *Spirit* gave them utterance." The multitude, which was composed of many nations, heard them speak in their own language.

These works of the Spirit require divine attributes. To pass over those works, which he performed in common with the Father and the Son, those acts, which are peculiar to his distinct office must be attributed to divine power. If it required divine power to create, it required equal power to repair the defaced works of creation. If it required divine power to form man, it requires the same power to renew his fallen nature. It requires as great effort to change, as to form a nature. The Spirit, without doing violence to the human will, and without infringing upon moral freedom, changes the disposition of the heart. Power less than divine cannot change nature or its laws.

In order to strive with man; to change his heart, and to lead him in the ways of truth and holiness, it is necessary to have a perfect knowledge of the human mind. If the Holy Spirit did not know the disposition of all hearts, he might not know on which to

bestow his influence, and what degrees of energy to put forth, to effectuate a change of different hearts. He needs to know what is in man, in order to remove the evil and set him right. It is not doubted that holy and fallen angels have access to the human mind and have influence upon it. But the sacred scriptures do not attribute a power of changing the heart to either.

The apostle Paul, speaking of those great preparations, which are made in the other world for those, who love God, adds, "God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth *all* things, yea, the deep things of God." The deep things of God relate to the salvation of man. These things the angels desire to look into; but by reason of their finite powers, it appears, they are unable. But the Spirit searcheth these things, and is perfectly acquainted with them. He as fully knows the things of God, as the Spirit of a man knows the things of a man.

The revelation of the divine will by the Spirit, is an argument in favor of his divine knowledge. "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." He did not reveal them to his Spirit; for the Spirit of God *knoweth* the things of God. These things the Spirit communicated to the prophets and apostles. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Wisdom is also attributed to the Spirit. When it was prophesied that a Branch should grow out of the root of Jesse, it was also prophesied, "the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him; the Spirit of *wisdom* and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge."

The communications made by the Spirit to men, afford evidence of his particular agency and divinity. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same *Spirit.* To one is given by the *Spirit*, the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same *Spirit.* To another faith by the same *Spirit;* to another the gifts of healing by the same *Spirit;* to another the

working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues. But all these worketh that one and the self same *Spirit*, dividing to every man severally as *he will*." There is no intimation given that the Spirit derived his power and authority from a superior Being to bestow these miraculous gifts on the apostles. When the prophets and apostles wrought miracles, they attributed the works ultimately to God. But the Spirit distributed these gifts as *he would*. This conveys the idea of his independence. If miraculous operations are an evidence of the existence of God, they are, when attributed absolutely to the Holy Spirit, an equal evidence of his divinity.

The sacred scriptures afford evidence that the Spirit is omnipresent. Various texts convey the idea that the influence of the Spirit is shed abroad in mankind generally. "My Spirit shall not always strive with man. Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye." The influence of the Spirit upon believers is repeatedly asserted in the word of God. It was a petition of the Psalmist, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." If operation in the material and intelligent world forms an argument in favor of God's omnipresence, operation of the same extent in the moral world, forms an equal argument in favor of the omnipresence of the Spirit, and consequently of his divinity. The question of the Psalmist, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?" implies that it was impossible to flee from his presence.

Goodness is attributed to the Spirit. The Psalmist saith, "Thy Spirit is good." Goodness is attributed to the Father and the Son. If it be a divine attribute in them, there is no cause to say, it is not a divine attribute when applied to him.

The Spirit is eternal. The apostle Paul to the Hebrews, speaking of the sacrifice of Christ, says,

"who through the *eternal* Spirit offered himself without spot to God."

The names given to the Spirit are an evidence of his divinity. He is, by way of eminence, called *the* Holy Spirit. This title is equivalent to that given to God, the Holy One. It is with peculiar propriety that he is called the Holy Spirit, or Spirit of Holiness. He is not only holy himself, but he is the Author of holiness in the human heart. He is called the Spirit of truth. He revealed truth to the prophets and apostles; led them into all truth, and enabled them to communicate it to the world. When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, and will shew you things to come.

He is called the Holy Spirit of promise. The Spirit was promised through the medium of John the Baptist. Christ, just before his ascension into heaven, observed to his disciples, "I send the promise of the Father unto you." So frequently had the Spirit been promised, that it was with propriety he was called "the Promise," or the Spirit of promise. He is also called the Spirit of wisdom and knowledge, and the eternal Spirit. Christ styles him the Comforter, Christ said to his disciples, "the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things. If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you." He gives comfort to sinners by changing their hearts and giving them an enjoyment, which they never before experienced. He gives comfort to believers by increasing light in their minds; and by leading them forward toward heaven. He witnesseth with their spirits that they are born of God.

The fruit of the Spirit is love; love to God and man. It is joy; joy arising from holy affections and from divine service. It is peace; peace of mind and peace in society. It is long-suffering; it is a patient bearing of injuries. It is gentleness; softness of manners.

It is goodness; a kind disposition carried into operation. It is faith; confidence in divine promises, and fidelity in trusts and engagements. It is meekness; calmness under provocations. It is temperance; a moderate use of the bounties of providence. These virtues are the fruit of the Spirit. Such holy fruit indicates that the Spirit is holy and divine.

The Father and the Son send the Holy Spirit to do the works of his office. John the Baptist, speaking of Christ said, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Agreeably to this declaration, Christ after his ascension sent down the Holy Spirit upon his apostles; and cloven tongues like as of fire sat upon each of them, and they were filled with the Holy Ghost. "How much more shall your heavenly Father *give* the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." "When the Comforter is come, whom *I will send* unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father." Christ saith, "*I will send* him unto you." "The Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him. Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Because the Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son, it is probable he is called sometimes the Spirit of the Father, and sometimes the Spirit of Christ.

If the Spirit is *sent* by the Father and by Christ, it is only an official subjection; it implies no inferiority of nature. The covenant of redemption was made between the Father and the Son, and the Spirit, and they are employed in the salvation of this fallen world. So intimate is the union between them that one can do nothing without the other; and what is attributed to one is generally attributed to either; and yet they are so distinct that particular names, offices and works are given to each.

Divine honors are given to the Holy Spirit. The ordinance of baptism is administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

By this ordinance persons are consecrated to the sacred Three. If it be an ascription of honor to the Father to consecrate one's self or his offspring to his service, it is an equal honor to the Son to make such consecration to him; and it is the same honor to the Holy Spirit to make the same consecration to him. By making a dedication to the Father, Son and Spirit, it conveys an idea of distinction in the divine nature. When people are baptized in, or into the name ("not names") of the Father, Son and Spirit, it implies that one name, the name God, is common to them all. It is hard to conceive why these three are unitedly named in the ordinance of baptism, if there be not a union of nature subsisting between them, and the same honor is not conferred on each. The blessing, which the apostle Paul pronounced upon the Corinthian church, gives the same honor to the Spirit as to the Father, and Son. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all." Here again the Three are united, and the same honor is given to each.

It is a great sin to oppose or speak against the Holy Spirit. The prophet Isaiah, speaking of the Jews under the blessings of Heaven, says, "They rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit; therefore he was turned to be their enemy; and he fought against them." Particular commands are given in the sacred scriptures not to sin against the Spirit. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God. Quench not the Spirit." If there were not something in the divine nature peculiar to him, it is hard to conceive why he should be singled out by name; and his rights be secured by a barrier of divine commands. The martyr Stephen addressed his unbelieving audience as great sinners, because they always resisted the Holy Ghost. So great is the guilt of the sin against the Holy Spirit, that the apostle Paul expressly declares that it is impossible for those, who were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, if they fall away, to renew them again

to repentance. There is a sin unto death. Supplication is not to be made to God for its remission. This is thought by many to be a sin against the Holy Ghost.

The apostle Peter charged Ananias and Sapphira with tempting the Spirit of the Lord; with lying to the Holy Ghost. He added, "thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." It is noticable that, in these passages, lying to the Holy Ghost is lying to God. So great was their sin that their lives were miraculously taken from them.

Christ, in answer to the Pharisees who accused him of casting out devils by Beelzebub, said, "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh a word against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in that which is to come." This declaration of the Savior proves the great criminality of sin against the Holy Spirit. Whether it is more criminal in its nature to speak against the Holy Spirit, than it is to speak against the Father or the Son, it is not the province of human reason to decide. It is sufficient that Christ has said, this sin is unpardonable. The decision of divine authority upon this subject proves that it is, at least, as criminal to sin against him, as it is to sin against the Father or Son. This is a forcible evidence in proof of the Spirit's distinction, of his divinity, and of his claim to divine service.

When the sacred scriptures represent the Holy Spirit, possessing certain attributes, and acting in a certain office; when they give him divine names, attribute to him divine properties, and divine works; ascribe to him divine honors, and represent sin against him to be the only one which is unpardonable, there appears to be as much proof of his distinction and divinity, as there is of the distinction and divinity of the Father or Son.

1. It is proper to notice some objections, which are brought against the divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is thought by some that the Holy Spirit is the fulness of the Godhead; or the productive, efficient emanations of divine fulness; that the Holy Spirit bears the same relation to God as the rays of the sun bear to the sun.

This comparison appears to be defective. The rays of the sun are not the fulness of the sun. They are not a source from which light and heat proceed. It is not philosophical to say, light proceeds from light; and heat proceeds from heat. The rays of the sun depend on the sun. If the sun were extinguished, his rays would cease. Subordination, but not dependence, is attributed, in the scriptures, to the Spirit. They attribute to him sovereignty, when they represent him distributing miraculous gifts severally as *he will*. If the Holy Spirit be but an emanation of the Deity, it appears highly improper that a proper name should be given him; that divine attributes should be attributed to him; and that he should be represented in an official capacity. If he be sometimes represented passively, or as the operation or effect of the Deity, it is when he acts in his office in subordination to the Father and the Son, or when his operations are spoken of.

2. The distinction and divinity of the Holy Spirit is denied, because he is called the Spirit *of* God; as divine power is called the power of God; as a human spirit is called the spirit of a man. Hence it is inferred that the Spirit of God bears the same relationship to God as his attributes bear to him; or as the spirit of a man bears to a man. It is true the Holy Spirit is represented as something belonging to God. So the Father and the Son are represented as something belonging to God, or the divine nature. But this does not deprive them of divinity. The Holy Spirit is sometimes called the Spirit of the Father, and sometimes he is called the Spirit of Christ. If the Holy

Spirit bears the same relation to the Father and Son as the spirit of a man bears to a man, and the Father and Son be two entirely distinct beings, it follows that there are two Holy Spirits. It is probable the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God or of the Father, because he is sent by him and acts in subordination to him. The spirit of man does not mean the man, so the Holy Spirit of God does not mean the divine nature without its distinctions; but it means one of the divine plurality.

3. "The breath of the Lord is used as synonymous with the Spirit of the Lord. The hand of the Lord and the Spirit of the Lord are used as synonymous. The finger of God and the Spirit of God are synonymous." From this statement it is inferred that it is not proper or respectful to speak of one self-existent person as the breath, the hand, the finger of another co-equal person.

In reply to this objection, it is worthy of notice that the original word, which is translated spirit, also signifies breath, or wind. As wind is a powerful, subtle, invisible agent, there is a propriety in giving the same name to the Spirit, whose operations are powerful, subtle and invisible. It is a striking trait in the Hebrew language that one word is used to signify different things, when there is a striking analogy or resemblance between those things. Because the Spirit is called by a name, which signifies breath or wind, it does not follow that he is this substance. When God is called a Rock, it does not mean that he is a rock, but that there is a striking resemblance between them. It is no more disrespectful to the Spirit to call him by a name signifying breath or wind, than it is to call God a fire, and Christ a fountain. It is not disrespectful to apply pertinently figurative language to the divine nature.

Because people work with their hands or fingers, God is said to work in the same manner. As the Spirit is in his hand to send him where he pleaseth,

it is proper to say by a figure of speech, when he worketh by his Spirit, that he worketh with his hand. This mode of speech is adapted to our capacities. We have not an adequate idea of the operations of pure Spirit.

4. As the sending or giving the Spirit is represented by pouring out, shedding forth, sprinkling, washing or baptizing; and the descent of the Spirit is compared to the descent of rain and dew, it is thought to be improper to apply this metaphorical language to the Spirit, if he be one of the Trinity.

The propriety of this figurative language, when applied to the Spirit, arises from the nature, the operations, and the effects of the Spirit. Pouring out, sprinkling, washing, &c. are literally applied to water. They are figuratively applied to the operations of the Spirit, because the Spirit is, in his nature, like water, pure. In his effects he is, like water, purifying. Like water he invigorates and fructifies. Like the rain and dew he is gentle in his operation. When there is such a striking similarity between the Spirit and water, it is proper to take those phrases, which are literally applied to water and apply them figuratively to the Spirit. Such pertinent figurative allusions do not militate against the divinity of the Spirit. If the Holy Spirit be but an emanation of divine fulness, it would be as uncouth to apply the phrase, pour out, to such an emanation as to apply it to the operations of the Holy Spirit. The difficulty arises from confounding figurative, with plain language.

5. God's giving his Spirit without measure to Christ is thought to militate against the divine nature of the Spirit. The man Christ Jesus received extraordinary communications of the Spirit. He received greater aid from him than the prophets or apostles received. Because he received such copious effusions of the Spirit, it is said the Spirit was given to him not by measure; i. e. abundantly. It argues no more against the divinity of the Spirit that he was given to Christ

without measure, than that he was given to the prophets and apostles *by* measure. By measure and without measure denote the different degrees of the gifts or aid of the Spirit.

6. Because the original word in the New Testament, translated Spirit, and the articles and pronouns, agreeing with it or referring to it, are of neuter gender, it is inferred that the Spirit is not of divine nature.

The Hebrew word for Spirit is of masculine termination. But not to insist on this, the Greek word for Spirit in this text, "God is a Spirit;" is of neuter gender. But the use of this gender in this passage does not prove that God is a mere thing, and not a divine Being. The Greek word for the spirit of man, for holy and for fallen spirits is of neuter gender. But this carries no evidence that the spirit of man is not human, or that the spirit of angels is not angelic. The Greek words for babe, and for children, whether they be youth or the children of God, are of neuter gender. But this use of this gender does not prove that they do not belong to the human family, or that they are not of human nature. The Holy Spirit is called the Comforter. The original word, translated Comforter, and the articles and pronouns agreeing with it, or referring to it, are of masculine gender. When Christ calls him *another* Comforter, he ranks him equal with himself; and at the same time points out his distinction and divinity.

The Greek language was formed long before the Gospels and Epistles were committed to writing. The Greek word for spirit was of neuter gender. The inspired writers were not commissioned to make innovations in language. They took the word as it was, and applied it to the Holy Spirit. It is probable that they did not suspect it would mislead the human mind in succeeding ages, any more than when it was applied to man or angel.

7. Much is said in the scriptures of the mutual love between the Father and the Son, and the dispo-

sition of each to honor the other. It is suggested that such reciprocal love between the Spirit and the Father, and between the Spirit and the Son, is not mentioned in the scriptures. This forms another objection to the divinity of the Holy Spirit.

The reason, for which the love between the Father and Son is so frequently and fully expressed in the Bible, probably is the near relationship, which subsists between them; the covenant, which was formed and ratified by them and the sufferings and humiliation of the Son to support the authority of God. If the love between the Spirit, and the Father, and Son, be not so fully expressed in the Bible, the love is naturally inferred from the language of scripture. The Spirit harmonizes with them in the covenant of redemption. He co-operates with them in the work of salvation. In his office he is subordinate to them and submissive to their commands. This harmony and concurrence between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit suppose that reciprocal affection subsists between them. At the baptism of Christ the Holy Spirit descended, rested upon him and performed that act of consecration, which the application of water represented. His continuance with Christ indicated the union and affection, which subsisted between them.

8. Much is said in the scriptures of the love of the Father towards mankind, and also of the love of the Son. It is suggested that there is nothing said of the love of the Holy Spirit toward the human race. On this ground it is objected that the Holy Spirit is not of divine nature.

Much is said in the sacred scriptures which implies the love of the Holy Spirit toward mankind. His works express his love. He strives with sinners for the benevolent purpose of convincing them of their sin and of their danger. He does not relinquish this gracious work till he has been long and obstinately resisted. He changes the human heart. He carries on the work of sanctification till the day of the Lord

Jesus. He qualifies his subjects for the reception of the benefits of Christ's righteousness. To qualify people to receive the benefits of Christ's sacrifice is a work no less benevolent and gracious than the offering of the sacrifice itself.

The Holy Spirit expresses an earnest desire that sinners should reform and be saved. "The Holy Ghost saith, to day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." God by his apostle commanded saying, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." This command implies that the Holy Spirit is grieved on account of the hardness of the human heart. The scriptures attribute to the divine Being, human shape, human organs, and human passions. This mode of expression is adopted not to convey the idea that God possesses these human properties, but to represent his actions as if he were influenced by human sensations. When the Holy Spirit is brought to view grieving for the sinful, unhappy state of man, he appears in the exercise of the tenderest love, and desirous to promote the salvation of man. He is called the Comforter. He administers consolation to converted sinners. He gives them peace and quietude of mind and hope of future blessedness. In this view of the Holy Spirit he appears not only in the exercise of love to the human race, but he appears in a distinct and official capacity.

9. We are required to love the Father and the Son; but as we are not commanded expressly and distinctly to love the Spirit, it is inferred that he is not of divine nature.

Where is it expressly commanded in the Bible to love the Father distinctly; or to love the Son distinctly? The divine command is, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart. The command has no respect to any distinction in the divine nature; but it applies to all that belongs to it. When we are commanded to love God, we are required to love all, which is

embraced in the term God; and this general name usually embraces the Father, Son, and Spirit.

10. It is objected to the Spirit's divinity, that there is no express command to render worship to him.

When the Spirit is united with the Father and Son in the ordinance of baptism, the same honor is given to him as to them. When it is considered that speaking against the Holy Spirit is the greatest of sins, that it is unpardonable, it is astonishing that any should view him standing in a disrespectful situation; that any should view him not entitled to divine honors, nor claiming the prerogatives of divinity. When God is worshipped, the Spirit, if he belong to God, is also worshipped.

The Holy Spirit is represented by many passages of scripture to possess divine properties and to perform divine works. Sometimes he is represented in a passive form. It is then he acts in subordination to the Father and the Son. It is not a fair construction of the scriptures to turn plain declarations from their most natural meaning into a figurative signification for the purpose of strengthening a particular class of texts, or for the purpose of supporting a favorite theory.

In the work of salvation there appear to be three offices, three kinds of works, and three characters. One proposes, another complies. One pays the ransom, another accepts; and the third prepares subjects to receive its benefits. All this is done with perfect harmony; and each is entitled to equal love and veneration.

It has been asserted by some that no name, attribute, nor work is attributed exclusively to the Holy Spirit. (See *Purves*, pp. 8. 15.) From this it is inferred that the Holy Spirit is God the Father, or that it is his energy, influence, or operation. It does not appear to be certain that this position is true. He is called the *Holy Spirit; the Spirit of truth.* The Father is called holy. God is called a Spirit; and he is called

the true God. But he is not called in scripture *the Holy Spirit; nor the Spirit of truth.* Holy Spirit appears to be as proper and as discriminating a name as the name Jesus Christ. Some things are predicated of the Holy Spirit, which are not predicated of the Father. "The Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, like a dove upon him," (i. e. Christ) Luke 3:22. It appears to be no more incredible that the Holy Spirit should assume a certain similitude, than that the Son of God should do the same before his incarnation. It is believed that the Father never has manifested himself by any likeness. "No man hath seen God at any time," John 1:18. Christ, speaking of the Father, says, "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, *nor seen his shape*," John 5:37. The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ. "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his *Son* into your hearts," Gal. 4:6. The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ, either because he rested upon him in his human nature, or because he was sent by him into the world. But the Father is not called the Spirit of Christ. It is through the Spirit, Jews and Gentiles have access to the Father. "We both have an access *by one Spirit* unto the Father," Ephes. 2:18. It was not by the Father they had access to the Father. Nor is it probable that it was by the energy of the Father, they had access to him.

The conception of Mary is attributed to the Holy Spirit. "She was found with child of the Holy Ghost. That, which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost," Matt. 1:18,20. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also, that holy thing, that shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God," Luke 1:35. In the two first of these passages, Mary's conception of the body of Jesus is attributed to the Holy Ghost. In the latter passage, in which the *manner* of her conception is described, the Holy Ghost and the power of the Highest are both brought to view.

If the power of the Highest is any thing different from the Holy Ghost, it implies the joint operation of the Father and the Holy Spirit. It is believed that no divine work is performed, exclusively by the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit. But the influence in the conception of Mary was so *peculiarly* the Holy Spirit's, that the work is attributed to him.

Jesus Christ has authority to send the Holy Spirit into the world. "But when the Comforter is come, whom *I will send* unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me," John 15:26. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart *I will send him* unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. Whatsoever *he shall hear*, that shall he speak, and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me; for *he shall receive of mine;* and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I, *he shall take of mine*, and shall shew it unto you," John 16:7,8,13,14,15. Whoever, or whatever the Comforter, the Spirit of truth is, he or it, is evidently *subordinate* to Jesus Christ. What he *hears* he speaks. He is *sent* into the world. He *receives* of Christ. These passages as decisively express his *subordination* to the Son, as any passages in the scriptures express the Son's *subordination* to the Father. It will not be maintained that the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, is God the Father. Suppose then that it is his energy, influence, or operation. Christ has authority over it. *He sends* it into the world. Whatever this influence shews unto the world, it *receives* of Christ. It is an extraordinary economy indeed if the Son is *subordinate* to the Father, and at the same time has *authority* over his energy, influence, or operation. To say the least, it is as mysterious as the doctrine of the distinction and divinity of the Holy Spirit.

In the passages, which have been quoted, and in many others, the Holy Spirit appears to possess all

the qualities of divinity. But we are told that the influences of the Father are personified, and are called the Holy Spirit. It appears evident that we are sometimes to understand the name *Holy Spirit*, to import only his influences or communications. The figure, *personification*, is often used in the sacred scriptures. But it is hardly credible, that Christ in his discourse with his disciples respecting the great and important communication, which he would make to them after he had left the world, should adopt such figurative language. In the simple narration of events, which were to take place, we should not naturally expect a train of personifications connected with plain language. We should hardly expect that the form of baptism would be made up of words partly of natural and partly of figurative meaning. To baptize persons in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the influences of the Father, appears to be a striking incongruity. There appears to be just as much ground for asserting that the two first names in the form of baptism are figurative, as that the last is so.

If all the names, attributes, and works, which are attributed to the Holy Spirit, are also attributed to the Father, it does not appear to follow that he is the Father, or his influences. It is believed there is such a union of nature, and such a concurrence of operation between the Father and the Holy Spirit, that what is attributed to one may be attributed to the other. Besides, he appears to be subordinate to the Father and the Son. If, in the performance of the works peculiar to his office, he is commissioned or sent by them, it is agreeable to the common use of language, and to the general apprehensions of people to attribute the same work to either. For example; the chief magistrate of a nation sends an ambassador to a foreign court. The latter negotiates and adjusts some important matters. The former approves what he has done. The negotiation is attributed indiscriminately to each.

Some passages in the sacred scriptures, which contain the name of the Spirit, appear to be difficult to be explained, unless we admit that he is, in some sense, distinct from the Father. "Through *him*, (i. e. Christ) we both have an access by one *Spirit* unto the *Father*," Ephes. 2:18. It will not be maintained that Spirit, in this text, signifies the Father. Nor does it appear evident that this one Spirit signifies the influences of the Father. It appears to be a very unnatural construction to say, we both have an access to the Father, by the one influence of the Father. It appears to be unnatural to suppose that the Father is inaccessible excepting by his own influences. The communication of his influences would imply that he was accessible. Admit the distinct operations of the Spirit, and the construction appears to be natural and easy. Through Christ we both have access by the influences of the Spirit unto the Father.

"The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with groanings, which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the *mind* of the *Spirit*, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God," Rom. 8:26,27. In these passages the Holy Spirit is represented interceding, groaning and having a mind; and he intercedes according to the will of God. This appears to imply distinct operation. It would be a bold figure to represent the influences of the Father, having a mind and making intercession to him according to his will. It would be a very unnatural construction to say that the Father, who searcheth the hearts, knoweth the mind of his own operations; and knoweth them on this ground, because their intercessions are agreeable to his will. We believe that the apostle did not thus darken his meaning by an unnatural use of words.

In view of the divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, it is inquired, "Must not three divine Beings be three Gods?—Does reason teach or admit the existence of three Gods, equal, and infinite in

divine attributes?—Does reason teach or admit the existence of three beings, equal and infinite in divine attributes?—Is it not difficult to conceive of, and contemplate three divine persons otherwise than so many separate and distinct beings?—Must not this one God then possess three sets of all divine attributes?—If all fulness dwelt in Christ by the will or pleasure of the Father, must not this fulness have been a derived fulness?—The fact however is, that the *fulness*, which dwells in Christ is the *fulness* of the *Father*." (See *Serious Inquirer*, pp. 6,7,30,43,49.)

It is not denied that some Trinitarian writers have given too much occasion for these inquiries. It is not denied that *difficulty* attends the contemplation of the divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Whether we contemplate the divine nature existing in plurality, or in unity, there is *difficulty*. It is not surprising that an infinite subject should be difficult for finite minds. It is unfortunate that the subject should be made to *appear* more difficult by ill chosen words and phrases. In treating of the divine Nature, it is not necessary to represent it consisting of three distinct beings, agents, or persons. Nor is it necessary to represent the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as distinct persons, agents, or beings. It is not necessary to attempt to explain the *mode* of divine subsistence. It is sufficient to shew from scripture that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are divine. When it is inquired, *how* can these things be? we do not attempt to answer the question. But if we find evidence from scripture that these things are so, it is sufficient to make them articles of belief?

When it is said that the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God, it is not to be understood that each is God, or possesses all divine attributes distinctly and separately from the other two. If this were the case, there would be three Gods. But it is to be understood that there is such a ground of distinction between them, that some works are *peculiarly*

attributed to the Father, some to the Son, and others to the Holy Spirit; and at the same time there is such a ground of union between them, that some works are attributed indiscriminately to each. It is replied, this distinction and this union in divine nature is unintelligible. Be it so. Let us bring under review a subject, with which we are better acquainted; and about which there is less dispute. Let us take human nature. Let us take man. He exists in *duality*. He consists of matter and spirit; or of body and soul. Some actions are attributed to one and some to the other; and some are attributed to both without discrimination. A man walks. The act is attributed *specially* to his body. But there is a concurrent action of his spirit, or mind. A man reflects, or calculates. The act is attributed *specially* to his mind. But there is no doubt that his mental exercises are affected, more or less, by his material part. We speak of a wise man, and of a strong man. In the one case we speak peculiarly of his corporeal nature; in the other, of his spiritual nature; and in both cases we include, by the word man, both natures. Could the body, in its individual capacity, speak, it might truly say, of myself I can do nothing. It is the mind, which dwelleth in me, that doeth the works. Does it follow from this that the body was not human, or did not belong to the man? Does it follow that the matter and spirit, which compose human nature, make two men? Is it difficult to conceive of, and contemplate on these two natures, body and soul, otherwise than so many distinct beings or men? Must this one man possess *two sets of all human qualities?* We allow that the distinction between, and the union of, soul and body are unintelligible. But upon evidence it is admitted as matter of fact. We affirm and deny the same thing of human nature. We say, man is mortal; and we say, man is immortal; we say he is material, and we say, he is spiritual; and we are believed. At one time Christ said, "The Father is greater

than I." At another time he claimed a relationship to him, by which he was understood to make himself God, or equal with God; and the apostle Paul states that he "thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

It is not supposed that divine Nature can be adequately explained, or illustrated by arguments drawn from human nature. But the foregoing observations are made to shew that if man exists in *duality*, there appears to be no impossibility that God should exist in Trinity; that if this *duality* in human nature does not involve two sets of all human properties, a Trinity in divine nature does not necessarily involve "three sets of all divine attributes;" that if the body and soul of man do not constitute him two distinct and separate beings, there appears to be no *necessity* of resolving the divine Nature, designated by the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, into three distinct and separate beings. From the mode of existence of human nature we do not infer what is the mode of divine existence. But when we admit the peculiar manner of human existence with all its difficulties, there appears to be no necessity of denying a peculiar manner of divine existence, when similar, and perhaps to our apprehension, not greater difficulties attend it.

It does not appear to be necessary to contend whether the two natures of Jesus Christ constitute *one person*, or not. The dispute is merely about names. When the name *person* is applied to Christ in both natures, it signifies something different from what it signifies when applied to any other being. Of course, objections may be raised against this complex personality, (as it is called) which would not lie either against his divinity or humanity. If it be proved by scripture that two natures are united in Jesus Christ, it is unnecessary to contend for the word *person*.

In examining the subject of divine Nature it is found that difficulty is not peculiar to the Trinitarian hypothesis. Those, who vindicate the simple unity of God,

believe his omnipresence. They believe he is present in different parts of the world and in heaven at the same time. They believe he exercises his attributes in different parts of creation at one and the same time; and that he is conscious of all his operations. He exercises divine power, wisdom and goodness on earth. At the same time he exercises divine power, wisdom and goodness in heaven. At the same time he is conscious of his operations in both places. We ask in our turn, must there not be as many consciousnesses, "as many sets of all divine attributes," as many distinct beings, or agents, as there are places, in which God is, and acts. God is here; and God is there. If he be wholly here, how can he be there? If he be partly here, and partly there, a part is less than the whole; and of course, must not something less than God be here; and something less than God be there; and must not the supposition imply a division of the divine nature? Let it be shewn how *these* difficulties may be removed, and it will help Trinitarians to remove the difficulties, which are alleged against their system.

"It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell," Col. 1:19. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," Col. 2:9. "But if all fulness dwelt in Christ by the will or pleasure of the Father," it is inquired, "must not this fulness have been a *derived fulness*?" Does it not seem to imply that for all the attributes or excellences, which Christ possessed, he was dependent on his Father?—The fact however is, that the fulness, which dwells in Christ, is the *fulness* of the *Father*. But what is this fulness, aside from those "treasures of wisdom and knowledge" imparted to Christ by the Father for the benefit of the church?—That the wisdom and power of the Father resided in him. (See *Serious Inquirer*, pp. 30,43.)

If the *fulness* of the Father, i. e. his wisdom, knowledge and power, was *derived* from him and dwelt in Christ, and he "possessed" them, it seems that, when

Christ *possessed* this *fulness*, the Father did not *possess* it, unless two distinct beings could possess the same numerical properties. As this is impossible, it appears that, if Christ possessed the *fulness* of the Father, the Father suffered a privation of his fulness; and that he retained nothing but his name. But if this be not the consequence, we inquire, would not the fulness of the Father, added to the man Christ Jesus, be greater than the Father himself? Is it possible that divine attributes can be transferred? Is it possible that a finite being can be the recipient and possessor of infinite qualities? If the fulness of the Father dwelt in Christ, in no other sense than it dwells in heaven, or on earth, or in christians, might not divine works be attributed, with as much propriety to them, as to him? And how could Christ express that reciprocal union, which subsisted between him and the Father, "*I am in the Father*, and the Father in me." If the Father retained all his attributes after he had imparted his *fulness* to Christ, would there not be an increase of divinity? Would there not be *two sets of divine attributes?* But where will our inquiries lead us? The fact is, it is easier to raise difficulties, than to remove them. We need to be cautious, lest we condemn that in others, which we approve in ourselves.

THE CONNEXION OF DIVINE PLURALITY WITH OTHER DOCTRINES OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

The different parts of Christianity perfectly correspond with each other. Its doctrines compose one great chain, whose links are intimately connected. If one doctrine be weakened, the whole system is affected. If one doctrine be expunged, the connexion is dissolved. It is not the province of human imperfection to define the utmost extent of error, which will not make the Christian religion another gospel. But it is evident that every error in religion is of evil tendency; and an incorrect opinion of one doctrine naturally leads to an incorrect opinion of others. Our holy religion is a well connected and proportioned system. Errors also have their connexion and proportion; and it is not seldom they are marshalled into a systematic form. If an incorrect sentiment of one doctrine of the Gospel be formed, this sentiment will not coalesce with other doctrines, till they are modified, perverted, diluted and despoiled of their true meaning. It is unnatural for truth to unite with error; and for error to unite with truth. There is no fellowship; there is no bond of union between them. As far as error is incorporated with divine truth, so far the truth suffers; and the Christian system is marred. Some errors are more pernicious than others. While

some strike at the foundation and subvert the whole fabric of Christianity, others only tarnish it.

The divine plurality appears to be not only a prominent, but an important doctrine of the scriptures. Every manifestation of the divine Nature appears interesting; but none is more so, than that, which is made in the work of redemption. Here, if any where, the Trinity is disclosed; and a belief or a denial of this doctrine is intimately connected with a belief, or denial of most of the doctrines of the gospel. The doctrine of the Trinity appears to give an excellence and importance to other doctrines of Christianity, which, by a denial of it, are wholly lost.

In the covenant of redemption there are contracting parties. The Father promises to give the Son the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; that he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; that he shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. This was promised him in view, and as a consequence of, his taking upon him the form of a servant, of humbling himself even to the ignominy and tortures of the cross. In view of this part of the covenant transaction, and of what he had to perform, the Son replied, "Lo, I come, (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." In the prosecution of the work of redemption the Holy Spirit appears engaged in renewing human nature; in enlightening and comforting believers, and sealing them to the day of redemption. His office and work afford evidence that he was concerned in the covenant of redemption.

If there be a plurality in the divine Nature; if the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit constitute this plurality, they are competent to form and execute covenant engagements respecting the salvation of the human race. Each is adequate to his own peculiar work. The excellence and dignity of the high contracting parties give the greatest degree of importance

to the transaction. The ability of each to fulfil his stipulated part, and the unity of design subsisting between them, afford ground of perfect confidence that the covenant engagements will be performed. The same Being, who, in plurality, said, "let us make man," was equally able to say, let us redeem man.

But if there be no ground of distinction in the divine Nature; if the Son of God be merely a created being; if the Holy Spirit be only the operations of the Father, the covenant of redemption appears to lose its peculiar excellencies. The parties concerned are entirely disproportionate. There is no comparison between the Creator and a creature. It appears to be a manifest incongruity, that God should enter into compact with a created being respecting any matter, in which the latter was not personally concerned. To treat with him by an interchange of correspondent obligations seems to imply an exaltation of the creature to an equality with himself; or an abasement of himself to a level with the creature. In forming the covenant of redemption, did infinite Wisdom need the assistance of any created intelligence? In carrying it into operation did the Almighty need the dependent power of any created being? It is not doubted that the Supreme Being employs ministering servants as agents in the administration of his government. But which of his agents stipulates with the divine Sovereign, and produces claims upon him correspondent to his own obligations? The claims of the Son upon the Father to fulfil his part of the contract are not less valid and important than the claims of the Father upon the Son. What makes this case different from all other cases is this, what the Son did in redemption he did not for himself, but for others. He has, therefore, not only a claim upon the Father arising from promise, but he has a *meritorious* claim upon him to fulfil his part of the covenant. What created being can, after he has discharged his own personal obligations, produce a surplus of righteousness, which may

be accounted for the benefit of others; and then produce a claim upon heaven for remuneration for extra services? Were this the case, were this the ground of salvation, then a created being would be the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth He would be made unto us wisdom, sanctification and redemption.

The disparity between the Creator and a creature seems to preclude the possibility of their being contracting parties respecting the redemption of man. The disparity is infinitely greater than that existing between the highest sovereign on earth and his lowest subject. If the Son of God be merely a created being, he does not possess one quality in his nature, which renders him competent to contract with the Father, or to fulfil covenant engagements respecting the salvation of man. His wisdom would not be sufficient to devise concerning those things, which the angels desire to look into. His own power would not be competent to the performance of his part of the compact. Every thing pertaining to him and to his work would be limited; and he would be entirely incompetent to be a party in the covenant.

If the Holy Spirit be not a party in the covenant; if he be only divine operation or influence, there appears to be an incongruity and deficiency in the scheme of redemption. It is the office of the Father to send the Son to fulfil his part of the covenant; to answer his requests; to accept what he does; and give him, as a recompense, what he had promised. It is part of the office of the Son to send the Holy Spirit to convince and convert sinners; to comfort believers and seal them to the day of redemption. If the Son be sent by the Father, if he be subordinate to him in his official work, it is incredible that he should have authority over the Father to control his operations and send them when and where he pleases. This would reverse the order of offices; and produce confusion in the economy of redemption. But if the Son

and Holy Spirit be divine, as well as the Father, they are on equality; and they are suitable parties to enter into reciprocal compact. They are adequate to the performance of their respective parts. The covenant of redemption is an instrument, formed and confirmed in all its articles by Divinity; and carries evidence with itself that it will be fulfilled.

Let the doctrine of the Trinity be next viewed in relation to the atonement. If the Son of God be divine, it was infinite condescension for him to take upon him the form of a servant. He subjected himself to the lowest degree of humiliation, when he veiled his divine glories with humanity in its lowest condition; when he suffered the scoffs and reproaches of his enemies; when he endured all the ignominy, which could be cast upon a crucified malefactor. The whole term of his abode on earth was a continued series of deep humiliation. The union of divinity with humanity gave the latter an extraordinary dignity and excellence. So intimate was the connexion of divinity and humanity that the second man is called the Lord from heaven; and the blood of the Son of man is called the blood of God. By the union of the Son of God with the Son of man, the sufferings of the humanity of Christ acquired an unspeakable importance; and in conjunction with the abasement of the divine Son, they constituted a sacrifice, which was a propitiation for the sins of the world. Look at the cross and behold divinity and innocent humanity engaged in making an expiation for sin; the one enduring a concealment of his glories, and all the ignominy, which his enemies could cast upon him; and the other suffering the tortures of the cross. In this view the atonement appears to be of infinite importance.

By the worth of the sacrifice, which was made, the guilt of sin may be accurately estimated. There was no suffering needlessly expended. If the victim, which was offered upon the cross was of infinite

dignity and excellence, it follows that sin, which required such a sacrifice, was of infinite guilt.

Admit the divinity of Christ and the consequent value of the atonement; and God's law appears perfectly honorable. If the sacrifice be commensurate with the guilt of sin, the divine law suffers no diminution of its requirements, or of its validity. It exhibits proof that it requires perfect satisfaction for every violation, or that, which will equally preserve its authority and efficacy. It exhibits proof that not one jot or tittle of its requirements is abated; and that while mercy is exercised, justice is satisfied. If the sacrifice for sin be made by the Son of God in conjunction with the Son of man, the divine law appears to be as fully honored and magnified, and God expresses as great abhorrence of sin, as if the threatened penalty were inflicted upon transgressors.

But if the Son of God be merely a created being, there appears to be less condescension on the part of divinity. There appears to be less value in the atonement. Sin appears with less malignity; and the divine law appears with great abatement of its requirements. If Jesus Christ was merely human, it was no condescension in Deity that he came into the world, labored and suffered as he did; and it was no greater condescension and humiliation in himself than many others have endured. Thousands have appeared in the form of servants; and have innocently suffered the tortures and ignominy of execution as malefactors. If the Son of God was the highest of all created intelligences, his coming into the world in the form of a servant, and suffering the disgrace and tortures of the cross would be no humiliation on the part of Deity; and his own humiliation appears infinitely less than if he were divine.

If the Son of God be only a created being, whether human, or human and superangelic, he does not appear to be capable of making a propitiation for the sins of the world. It is hard to conceive that any

creature, however exalted, can perform more than his own duty; or that he should have a surplus of righteousness to appropriate for the benefit of others. If one should volunteer his services for the assistance of another, he would be either under obligation, or not under obligation to do it. If he were under obligation to tender the kind offices, he would do only what was his own duty. If he were not under obligation to offer his kindness, he would not do his own duty while he communicated assistance to others. Of course, there would be an interval, in which he was free from discharging his own personal obligations; and could perform duty in behalf of others. But not to insist on the inconsistency of such a method; the assistance, which one created being can bestow upon another, is limited in its very nature. Suppose one man dies for another. The sufferings of the former are only equivalent to the life of the latter. Suppose one should offer his life for the preservation of the lives of several of his equal fellow beings, the offering would be unequal to the object to be accomplished. If he should offer his life to save one soul from everlasting death, the sacrifice would be entirely inadequate for the purpose. Should he offer his life for the salvation of the whole human race from endless destruction, what numbers could give the disproportion between the sacrifice and the object to be obtained! A sacrifice made by any created being bears no comparison in its value with the sacrifice made by Divinity in conjunction with humanity.

If the atonement be of limited value and efficacy, sin appears to be of finite guilt. There is a just proportion, an exact correspondence between the virtue of the sacrifice and the malignity of sin, which is expiated by it. As much as any system reduces the excellence of the victim and the consequent value of his sacrifice, just so much it reduces the guilt and ill desert of sin. If a finite being can make atonement for sin, it follows that sin is but a finite evil.

The honor and force of the divine law is in proportion to the guilt of transgression. A transgression of civil law, viewed only in relation to this law, is a finite evil. It is committed by a finite being against a limited authority; and the transgressor can make satisfaction or expiation for his crimes. He can satisfy the demands of the law which he has violated. The limitations of the guilt of his offences denote the limitations of the law he had transgressed, and of the authority, which he had offended.

If transgression of the divine law contain but finite guilt, the law violated, and the Lawgiver must, of course, have those limitations, which appear to be inconsistent with the perfect authority of Jehovah. As much as the evil of sin is diminished, so much the law of God is shorn of its divine excellence, and becomes like another law. If sin be but a finite evil, the divine law cannot justly inflict, or threaten an infinite punishment. A victim of limited capacity could make an atonement; and if atonement were not made, a transgressor might make expiation for his own sins; and then claim exemption from further punishment. Deny the divinity of Christ, and the covenant of redemption appears less important; the atonement appears to lose much, if not all, of its virtue; sin appears to be divested of much of its criminality; the divine law appears to be weakened; and the whole method of salvation appears to suffer a great diminution of its divine excellences.

The doctrine of Christ's divinity proves that the love of God for the human race was very great. This is argued from the greatness of the Father's love for the Son. The Father testified of him in the most affectionate manner: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." "The Father loveth the Son; and hath given all things into his hand." But notwithstanding the intimate union subsisting between the Father and the Son, so that the latter is said to be in the bosom of the former; notwithstanding the greatness of the Father's love for his only begotten and

dearly beloved Son, yet he sent him into the world that he might redeem it. He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. The greatness of God's love for the world is inferred from his sending his Son into the world to make a propitiation for sin. If his Son were divine; if he were in union with him in all his counsels, and in all his operations, then it was a great thing, a great expression of love for the human race, to send this partner of his throne into the world in the form of a servant; to expose him to the greatest indignity, and subject him to the deepest humiliation. Such sacrifice on the part of Deity expresses, in the strongest manner, his love for fallen humanity. The scriptures represent the love of God toward the human race to be very great. "God *commendeth his love* toward us," Rom. 5:8. "Behold *what manner* of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God," 1 John 3:1. "Herein is *love*, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins," 1 John 4:10. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his *friends*," John 15:13. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time, Christ died for the *ungodly*," Rom. 5:6.

If the Son of God was merely human, divine love for the human race does not appear extraordinarily great in offering him in sacrifice for their salvation. Any sovereign, who had a sense of the interest of his kingdom, would, if occasion required, sacrifice one of his subjects, if his death would procure the preservation and highest interest of the rest. By this act he would manifest no more love for his kingdom than the value he set upon the subject he offered in their behalf. But if, instead of giving up one of his common subjects for the preservation of the rest, he should make an offering of his only son, the sole heir of all his substance and authority, his love for his kingdom would appear incomparably greater. In like manner, if the Son, whom God sent into the world

and offered in sacrifice upon the cross, were only human, his love for the world would not be manifested in a very high degree. It would appear only in exact proportion to the value he set upon the victim. If the Son, who was sent into the world were a super-angelic being, God's love for mankind in sending him into the world to make a sacrifice for sin, would appear greater, than if he were merely human. But upon this hypothesis his manifested love for the world would not answer to that high description, which is given of it in the sacred scriptures. It would appear unspeakably less, than it would appear by admitting that the Son, who made a sacrifice for sin, was not only the "second man," but "the Lord from heaven;" that he was not only in the "form of a servant," but that he was "the Lord of glory." Admit the divinity of Christ, and the love of God manifested toward the human race appears worthy of him; it appears adapted to their necessities; and correspondent to the language of scripture, which exhibits it.

The doctrine of Christ's divinity appears to be the foundation of justification by faith in his name. If he be divine, he is *mighty* to save. "He is *able* to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is *able* to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." The absolute sufficiency of Jesus Christ to save, appears to be expressed by these passages of scripture. If he possess this absolute sufficiency, he is able to make an expiation for sin. He is able to be the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. If he possess this ability, people may with safety have faith in his name. They may with consistency not only believe the doctrines, which he taught; but they may

repose entire confidence in his merits, and in the fulfilment of his promises. Faith in the Lord Jesus is one of the most prominent conditions of justification and salvation. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through *faith* in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. Whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. Ye believe in God, believe also in me." By this last text of scripture it appears that Christ designed to convey an idea that there was the same ground for believing in him, that there was for believing in God.

If Christ be divine, it is suitable that we should make him the Object of our faith, it is safe to make him the Object of our confidence and trust, it is his just due that we should view and honor him as the *Author* of salvation. There is no caution given, in the scriptures, lest we should love the Lord Jesus too much; repose too much confidence in his merits; or ascribe too much honor to his name. He testified that he had all authority in heaven and in earth; and he proved that it was his prerogative to forgive sins. Such a Being is a proper object of faith. Such a being is competent to make a sacrifice for sin, and to justify rebellious subjects on his own conditions.

If Jesus Christ be merely a finite being, deputized and commissioned of God to be a priest; to make an offering for sin, to be a Mediator and Savior, he must receive his qualifications from him, who appointed him to these high and important offices. If this be true, why does faith *terminate* in this dependent agent? Why

is not intimation given that he is but an instrument, by which God operates; that faith and confidence must not be reposed absolutely in him; but must extend ultimately to God? Why is not the divine prerogative guarded with greater circumspection; and why is not a barrier raised with such visible discrimination, that it would naturally prevent people from giving God's glory to another. Christ said, "ye believe in God, believe also in me." This language naturally conveys an idea, that belief in Christ was no less important than belief in God. When Christ was at meat in a Pharisee's house, a certain woman, who was a sinner, came and stood behind him weeping, washed his feet with tears, kissed them, anointed and wiped them with the hairs of her head. Jesus said unto her, "Thy sins are forgiven. *Thy faith hath saved thee;* go in peace." In view of her conduct toward Christ there can be no doubt that her faith was in *him;* and it appears equally evident that it was on the ground of this faith he forgave and saved her. Jesus said unto Thomas, "because thou hast seen me thou hast believed, *blessed are they, that have not seen, and yet have believed.*" John the Baptist taught the necessity and importance of faith in Christ. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." Christ expressed the same sentiment when he said, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." The apostles attached the same importance to faith in the Son of God. When the keeper of the prison inquired of Paul and Silas what he must do to be saved, their reply was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." The apostles taught, that justification was by faith in the Son of God. When the scriptures attach such an importance to faith in Christ, it seems unreasonable to believe that he is only a created being. God has sent prophets, apostles, and other holy men into the world, who have died martyrs for the cause of religion. He hath sent angels also to minister to

those, who are heirs of salvation. Of what avail would it be to trust in them? Or what connexion would there be between faith in them and salvation? The same undoubtedly, that there would be between faith in Christ and salvation, if he were not superior to one of them. If the Son be but a finite being, the ground of faith in his name appears to be greatly weakened; confidence in his merits appears to be presumption; and justification by faith in his name seems to cast the divine Sovereign into the back ground in the scheme of redemption. But admit the divinity of Christ and his union with the Father, and christian faith begins and terminates in Deity; confidence in the Savior is well founded; and justification, founded on faith in the merits of Christ, is consistent with the validity of the divine law.

The doctrine of the Trinity is intimately connected with the doctrine of saints' perseverance. If the contracting parties in the work of redemption be divine, each is able to perform, and will faithfully perform his stipulated part. The Son agreed to come into the world to do the will of his Father. It was the Father's will to lay upon him the iniquity of us all. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief." In view of this suffering, he said in prayer to the Father, "not as I will, but as thou wilt." At another time he said, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." He did and suffered according to contract, which was the will of the Father. As a recompense for what he did and suffered, he was to see his seed. He was to see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. He was to receive the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. Christ declared that the Father had given him some of the human race, "I have manifested thy name unto the men, which thou *gavest* me out of the world; thine they were, and thou *gavest* them me. I

pray not for the world, but for them, which thou hast *given* me.

Those, who are given to Christ are his, not by gift only; but they will be his by faith in him, and by union with him. "All that the Father giveth me, *shall come* to me." When they are renewed by the Holy Spirit, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, and are brought into his kingdom, they are truly his people; and he has then received his stipulated recompense. These constitute his kingdom; he has authority to rule over them, and he is their King. If he be divine, he is competent to this degree of sovereignty. He is able to keep his subjects under his dominion. The same Spirit which he sent to bring them into subjection to his authority, he is able to send for the purpose of guiding and supporting them in the ways of truth and obedience. If the Holy Spirit be divine, he is able to perform this part of the work. He is able to carry on the work of sanctification in the heart, till it is perfected. He is not only able, but he will do it. "He, which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." With his gracious operations believers are *sealed* unto the day of redemption.

Christ has expressed his ability to keep his subjects from apostasy. He saith, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish; neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand," John 10:28. "While I was with them in the world, *I kept* them in thy name; those, that thou gavest me *I have kept*, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, (i. e. but the son of perdition, not being given to me, is lost) that the scripture might be fulfilled," John 17:12. "Of them which thou gavest me have I lost *none*," John 18:9. "He is *able* to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them," Heb. 7:25. Now unto him that is *able* to keep you from *falling*, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with

exceeding joy," Jude 24. These texts appear to prove that Jesus Christ is *able*, and that he actually *does save* believers from final apostasy. It is admitted that Christ performs this work by sending the Holy Spirit, and by intercession with the Father. But what created being has authority to send the Holy Spirit into the hearts of believers to comfort and to stablish them? What created being has invariable prevalence with God in behalf of transgressors?

If Jesus Christ save his people from their sins, there appears to be evidence that he is divine. Those, who are renewed, are renewed by divine power. They are born of the Spirit; they are born of God. They are created in (or through) Christ Jesus unto good works. It requires no less power to preserve spiritual life in the soul, than it did at first to originate it. There is nothing in renewed humanity, which secures it from declension. If the parents of the human race apostatized from God, and lost their primitive dignity and purity, there is nothing in human nature, partially sanctified, which will secure it from final apostasy. As the Lord Jesus *keeps* his people so that none of them will be lost, there seems to be clear evidence that his power is divine.

The Son of God possesses all authority over his mediatorial kingdom. He is King of saints. But what is this extent of authority, if his *power* be not commensurate with it? If his power be finite, his kingdom appears to be less secure, than if his power were infinite. It appears that his subjects could not have perfect confidence in him. If they look to him for that divine influence, which is necessary to keep them from declension, what assurance can a finite being give, that he can command the operations of God's Spirit to guide and support them? Should he attempt to sustain them by his own power, the work would be disproportionate to his ability. Other power might be as great as his, and counteract all his operations. Or it might be greater than his, and subvert his whole

kingdom. But could not power be imparted to him from the infinite Being, which would enable him to secure all the subjects of his kingdom? It is admitted that power was communicated to the man Christ Jesus in the same manner as it was communicated to prophets and apostles; but in a higher degree. If, by the reception of this power, he was able to support spiritual life in believers, then prophets and apostles might do the same in proportion to the strength given them. But the scriptures afford no evidence that believers are, in any degree, kept from apostasy, by prophets, or apostles. Were it possible that a finite being should be qualified, by power imparted to him, to stablish his subjects unto the end, and to bring his kingdom to consummation, it seems improper to call him a king. It seems to be a perversion of language to call one a king or savior, who depends on a higher being for all his power and authority. An idea of absolute dependence does not correspond with our ideas of perfect sovereignty. If Moses could, with strict propriety, be called the savior of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage; if he could be called, in the true sense of the word, the author of the miracles, which God wrought by his hand, then might a created being, if competently endued with power from on high, be called the Savior of the world; or the Author of salvation. But it is evident that such is not the natural use of the words, author and savior. If Christ be not divine, it follows that the head of the church is not essentially different from one of the members of his body; that the head-stone of the corner is not essentially different from any stone of the building; that the Redeemer and redeemed are almost upon an equality. It seems that believers could not repose absolute confidence in his merits and efficiency. It seems that his subjects might be plucked out of his hand, and be finally lost. It seems that he could not assure the subjects of his kingdom below, that they would be subjects of his kingdom above. Limit the power of the Savior, and

the perseverance of saints appears to be uncertain; and there appears to be a *possibility* that he may lose a part, or all of his recompense. The divinity of Jesus Christ appears to be intimately connected with the final judgment of the human race. The scriptures abundantly assert that he will officiate as Judge on that important occasion; and administer reward and punishment according to characters. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom. When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

If Christ be divine, as well as human, he is worthy of the judgment seat; and he is competent to perform the duties of his office. If his knowledge be not circumscribed, he knows all the windings of the human heart. He knows all the thoughts, all the desires, all the words, all the actions of every individual of the human race, from Adam down to his latest offspring. If his wisdom be unlimited, he is able to compare every exercise of the human heart, and every action of human life with divine requirements, and discern their coincidence, or disagreement. He is able to weigh the guilt of every offence, and apportion punishment according to its desert. He is able also to

assign reward agreeably to the divine promises. If no power be greater than his, he can carry his decisions into execution. He can banish the wicked from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; and consign them to everlasting punishment; and he can receive the righteous to life eternal. If the Judge of the earth be divine as well as human, the scenes of the last day appear with the most awful solemnity. The human race, waked from their long sleep of death, and those who are alive on the earth are summoned to attend. He who created and redeemed the world appears on the judgment seat. With one look he distinguishes characters. With one word he separates them to the right and left. There is no deception. There is no error of judgment. The sentence is pronounced. There is no appeal. The work is done. The business of this all eventful day is closed for eternity. The object, the transactions, the issues of this day are worthy of a divine Judge.

If Christ be merely a created being, the judgment seat appears with less majesty; and the whole scene appears with less grandeur. It is presumed that no finite being can, by the efforts of his own mind, discern the whole character of every individual of the human race. It seems incredible that such an amazing extent of knowledge should be infused, at once, into any finite capacity. It appears incredible that any created being should be vested with authority to judge and pronounce sentence, in a case infinitely momentous, in his own name, and with all the majesty of divinity. If the judge be an unconscious organ, through which the Deity speaks and acts; or if he be prompted in every word and action by the divine Being, he appears with only borrowed excellence, borrowed authority, and with only a semblance of the majesty of a Judge. It is admitted that the divine Sovereign has a perfect right to administer his laws and to award retribution as he pleases. But at the same time it is expected that his method of government and of final decision

will be worthy of himself, and will manifest the perfections of his nature. Should the judiciary department of a civil government be naturally unqualified to perform the functions of their office; but were taught and dictated in every step of their proceedings by the chief magistrate of the state or nation, would not the bench labor under a burden of indignity, unbecoming the judgment seat? If we may reason from small things to great, it must be inferred, that, if Jesus Christ be not competent in his own nature to perform the duties of Judge of the world, he appears with infinitely less dignity; and the whole scene and all the transactions of the judgment day appear with much less grandeur, than if the Judge were divine, and of himself performed the duties of his office. If it be admitted that the Judge of the world unites in himself human and divine nature, he is not only touched with a feeling of human infirmities; but he has also a consciousness of divine claims. While he feels a lively interest in the restoration and happiness of humanity, he feels a holy jealousy for the rights of the divine throne.

The doctrine of Christ's divinity is intimately connected with the doctrine of future retribution. If Jesus Christ be both human and divine, he is able to make an expiation for sin; to satisfy the demands of the divine law; to work out a complete righteousness for the justification of the disobedient through faith in his name. Though sin be of infinite guilt, yet the victim offered upon the cross was sufficient to make an adequate expiation. Having magnified and honored the divine law, he was able to treat with rebellious subjects. He was able to propose his own conditions for their reconciliation and pardon. He was able to confer the promised reward upon those who should comply with the terms proposed; and he was equally able to inflict the punishment, which stood against impenitent transgressors.

If Christ be but a finite being, and still made a propitiation for sin, it follows that sin is of limited guilt; otherwise he could not have made a complete expiation. Admit the finitude of the Savior, and he appears inadequate to make provision for the everlasting blessedness of the human race. What can a finite being offer, which is equivalent to that eternal weight of glory, which is promised to the righteous. Should he plead all the finite qualities of his sacrifice, it would appear entirely disproportionate to a salvation from an infinite, an endless punishment. If the reward conferred on believers were only commensurate with his limited righteousness, the time would come, when they had received all that was purchased for them. It is natural to inquire, what will be their condition afterward?

If the sacrifice, offered upon the cross, was made by merely a created being, and the value of it was, of course, limited; if sin be but a finite evil, those, who die in their sins and receive the sentence of condemnation, are not in a desperate condition. As a limited ransom has once made satisfaction for iniquity, it may do the same again. As sin contains but finite guilt, finite punishment will make expiation for it. Of course, a point in duration will arrive, when transgressors, who died in impenitence, will have suffered all the punishment incurred by their offences during their probationary state. They will then have a claim to be liberated from their sufferings. As they had satisfied the demands of the law, they would be no longer under its curse. As they had not complied with the conditions of the Gospel, they could not receive its promises. It is hard to conceive what would be their situation. Admit the divinity of Christ and the righteous have assurance that they shall, in another state of existence, enjoy everlasting blessedness; and the finally impenitent have the same evidence that they shall suffer an equal duration of punishment. Deny the divinity of Christ, and there appears to be no

proof that the glory and blessedness of the righteous will be immortal; and there appears to be equal want of proof that the punishment of the wicked will be endless. By this hypothesis the encouragement and hope of the righteous are greatly abated; and the fears of the wicked are almost destroyed. Reward and punishment lose almost all their effect.

A correct belief of the Son is intimately connected with a correct belief of the Father; and a denial, or dishonor of the former implies a denial or dishonor of the latter. The relative names, Father and Son, express an affinity subsisting between them. If these names, which represent the distinctions of the divine Nature, are used figuratively, there is, undoubtedly, ground in the subject for this figurative language. When the names, father and son are used to express the relationship, subsisting between a parent and his male offspring, the first ideas, conveyed by these relative names, are their affinity and the sameness of their nature. If these names are correctly applied to the divine nature, they naturally convey the same ideas. If a parent be human, it follows, of course, that his son is human. If figurative language be drawn from this relationship, and applied to the divine Nature, it is expected that it will express some striking analogy between the relationship of the Father and the Son, and the relationship of a human parent and his child. If the Son be divine, this name expresses the analogy in the clearest manner; it expresses their intimate connexion, and the sameness of their nature. If the Son be not divine, the analogy is greatly weakened, and their relative names are much less expressive.

It is admitted that God is called the Father of the human family. In a more special sense he is called the Father of believers; and they are called his sons. It appears that Christ claimed a relationship with the Father much nearer than this. The Jews understood him to call God his Father in a peculiar sense, in a sense, which implied that he himself was divine.

After Christ had healed an impotent man on the Sabbath, the Jews accused him of profanation of holy time. He replied, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, (πατερα ἰδιον) making himself equal with God. ἰδιον is expressive and definite in its meaning; it signifies, peculiaris sui generis, suus. *Hed. Lex.;* (peculiar, of its own kind, his own.) Schleusner, under his first definition of the word gives the following significations; proprius, suus, et de omni, quod quis jure suum vocare potest, et ullo aliquo modo ad alequem pertinet. (Special, proper; his own, in respect to every thing, which one can justly call his own, and belongs, in any way, to him.)

At another time, when Christ called God his Father, the Jews accused him of blasphemy, because he being a man made himself God. It appears evident that the Jews believed that the Son of God was divine, and that he was the promised Messiah. But they believed that Jesus was not that personage; that he was merely a man, and that he made pretensions to divinity. In this view of the subject they imagined that he blasphemed by claiming a relationship with God, which implied equality. They believed, that by calling himself the Son of God, he blasphemed; and that, according to their law he ought to die as a blasphemer. If the Jews formed wrong ideas of the language of Christ, when he called God his Father, it seems not a little extraordinary that he did not correct their mistake; and shew them plainly that his relationship to God was to be understood in a reduced sense; that it was no more than the relationship of a creature to his Creator.

It is in vain to attempt to maintain that the Jews knowingly perverted the language of Christ; and made him say what he did not design to say. For the same word, which they connected with Father, to

express the near connexion of the Son with him and their sameness of nature, the apostle Paul connects with Son, to shew the special relationship of the Father to him, Rom. 8:32. The same meaning, which the unbelieving Jews attached to the word (ἴδιον) the apostle undoubtedly attached to it. If their application of it were preposterous, the apostle's application of it will stand with all its force.

If the connexion of the Father and Son imply the divinity of the latter, it follows that a denial of the Son implies a denial of the Father, as such; and the dishonor, which is cast upon the Son is cast also upon the Father. The scriptures represent the connexion of the Father and Son, to be so intimate that what is predicated of one is predicated of the other. "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, *these* also doeth the Son likewise. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, *even so* the Son quickeneth whom he will. As the Father knoweth me, *even so* know I the Father. If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him. The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." These texts afford evidence that there is such a union of the Father and Son, that there is a joint operation in all their works. Neither of them doeth any thing *of himself;* i. e. separately and distinctly; but what one doth the other doth also.

If there be this intimate connexion of the Father and Son, it is evident that what honors one, honors the other; that the Father may be glorified in the Son; and that whosoever had seen the Son had also seen the Father. This sentiment is clearly expressed in scripture. "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son. It appears that St. John considered a denial of the Son a denial of the Father.

This is evidently true in view of their relationship. If there be no Son, there is no Father; and if there be no Father, there is no Son. If relationship be denied on one side, it is, of course, denied on the other. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same doth not acknowledge the Father. He does not acknowledge his relationship. He does not acknowledge the testimony, which the Father bore concerning him at his baptism, at his transfiguration, and by raising him from the dead.

It will be better understood what St. John meant by a denial of the Son, if the occasion and object of writing his epistle be considered. At that time, there were some, who denied the divinity, and others, who denied the humanity, of Christ. One great object of this epistle was to correct these errors. In this epistle he calls Jesus Christ "that eternal Life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." He calls him the Son of God. He set it down as a test of true and inspired teachers that they confessed Jesus Christ was come in the flesh; and a denial of this truth, he considered a characteristic mark of antichrist. It is evident that by a denial of the Son, the apostle meant a rejection of his divinity or humanity; either of which would be a refusal to acknowledge him to be the Christ of God. When St. John speaks of the denial of the Son in connexion with a denial of the Father, he undoubtedly means, by Son, the divinity, not the humanity of Christ. On this ground it is manifest that he, who denieth the Son, doth not believe in the Father. The apostle James appears to have the same opinion of the connexion of the Father and the Son, when he speaks of false teachers, who denied the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

If the Son be not divine, a denial of his divinity is not a denial of the Father. If the Son be merely human, the connexion between his humanity and the

Father is not so near that a denial of the former implies a denial of the latter.

So intimate is the connexion of the Father and the Son, that denial, knowledge, sight, hatred and honor of one imply denial, knowledge, sight, hatred and honor of the other. "He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." Jesus said to the Jews, "Ye neither know me, nor my Father; if ye had *known me*, ye should have *known my Father* also." When Philip asked Christ to shew him the Father, he replied, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath *seen me*, hath *seen the Father*. He that *hateth me hateth my Father also*.—Now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father. He that *honoreth* not the Son, honoreth not the Father, which hath sent him."

If Christ be not divine, a denial of him is not a denial of the Father. People might deny him divine perfections, divine authority, and divine works, and at the same time acknowledge the divine authority of the Father. If the Son be not divine, people might see and know him, and, at the same time, they might neither see nor know the Father. They might hate him for his pretensions to divinity, and at the same time, not hate Divinity itself. They might honor him excessively, and, by that mean, they might dishonor the Father. But if the Son be divine, consequences follow agreeably to the Scriptures. He is not alone, but the Father is with him. What belongs to one belongs also to the other. Christ said, "All things that the Father hath are mine. All mine are thine, and thine are mine." Such is their union of nature and of operations, that what honors or dishonors the Son, honors or dishonors the Father.

It may be argued with some degree of plausibility, that if God send a messenger into the world to treat with the human race, though he be a created being, they ought to receive him in his delegated capacity, that they ought to honor him; and that an acknowl-

edgement of him and respect shewn him would be an acknowledgment of the sovereignty of heaven, and would reflect honor on the Divine Majesty. If the sovereign of a nation send a minister to negotiate with a foreign power, if that power receive him as a legitimate ambassador, this act is not only an acknowledgment of *his* authority, but it is an acknowledgment of the authority of *his sovereign*, and an expression of respect toward him. All this is undoubtedly true. But whom does he send to perform this important business? He sends one of his own species; a man like himself; equal in nature and capacity with his own. He is entitled by his nature and qualifications to as much honor as his sovereign; and being commissioned, he has the same authority to transact the business contemplated, as he, who sent him. It is expected that he will be honored, and the respect shewn him will extend to his sovereign. But suppose the sovereign sends a minister, who has not one *natural* qualification for the duties of his office, but is instructed, and dictated, and prompted in every word, and in every step of his proceedings, would he not be disrespected; and would not the disrespect be extended to him that sent him? The application is easy. If God has sent a messenger into the world to treat with the human race, who is not naturally qualified for the duties of his office, but is a mere instrument, or organ, through which the divine Being acts, it might be expected that people would respect him less than if he possessed natural qualifications for the duties of his office. It might be expected that they would deny him in his official capacity; and if they honored him even as they honored the Father, it would be by dishonoring both. But suppose the Son to be divine, and he is worthy of honor; and the glory, which is given him is given to the Father also.

The doctrine of the Trinity appears to be the main pillar of Christianity; the key stone of the arch, which supports the whole fabric; the basis of man's salvation. If this doctrine be expunged from the Bible, there

appears to be a chasm through the whole system. The most prominent doctrines of the gospel appear to stand or fall with it. If the divine plurality be denied, one mystery, it is true, is removed from the sacred scriptures; but in its place there appear to be left absurdity and contradiction. The Christian religion, without this doctrine, without this vinculum of other scripture doctrines, appears like a scheme of human invention, designed to reconcile contrarieties, and to effectuate impossibilities. This, more than any other doctrine, distinguishes our holy religion from human systems; and gives it an impression of its divine Author, which philosophy could never invent, nor ever efface. The light of nature never disclosed a method, by which sin could be forgiven, and transgressors be reconciled to God.

If the doctrine of the Trinity, as it has been exhibited, be a scriptural doctrine, those, who deny it are in great error. They deny the divine excellences of the Son of God. They deny the virtue of his atoning sacrifice. They deny his absolute ability to save. They deny him divine honor. Do they not, of course, deny the Lord, who *bought* them? They disbelieve the distinction of the Holy Spirit. They disbelieve his office and his peculiar work. If they do not speak a word against him, they withhold from him that distinct respect, which is his just due. But we need to use the greatest caution in this view of the subject. There is danger of drawing wrong inferences from others' premises; and if our conclusions from their positions are legitimate, they may, notwithstanding, heartily disown them.

If there be simple unity in the divine Nature, and divine plurality be not a scriptural doctrine, those, who embrace it are in great error. They place that confidence in a creature, which they ought to place only in the Creator. They make a creature equal with God; they make him God, they make him the "true God." They honor a creature "even as they honor the Father."

It is important to form correct sentiments of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. If we cannot form adequate conceptions of the ground of distinction in the divine Nature, nor of the ground of unity in the divine plurality, it is important that we should have such a belief in each, that we may apply to each respectively for the blessings, which it is their peculiar office to communicate.

There is an intimate connexion between belief and practice. It is not maintained that every one, who has a correct creed, possesses a good heart and exhibits a Christian character. The devils believe. But a belief of the truth has a natural tendency toward virtue and piety; and it would produce these effects, if there were no counteracting principle in human nature. The gift of revelation implies the necessity of believing it; and of believing it agreeably to its divine import. When Christianity is corrupted, it loses proportionably its good effect. When the Churches, which the apostle Paul planted, became disorderly and immoral, we find they had departed from sound doctrine. It is of no use to attempt to estimate the quantum of religion among different religious denominations; and compare their respective values. This is not the province of human reason. Were the attempt made, it is presumed that every one would find, or would *seem* to find most among those of his own name. But without boasting on the one hand, or unjustly criminating on the other, it may be safely said, that in proportion as people depart from the faith, which was once delivered to the saints, they decline in vital religion and in Christian character. If there must be contest for preeminence among Christians of different names, let it be a holy emulation to excel in promoting the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom, and in manifesting the spirit of the gospel. *Let it be admitted that he knows most of God, who walks nearest to him.*

THE END.